DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 280 592 PS 016 432

TITLE	The Children's Services Delivery System in California: Preliminary Report--Phase I.
INSTITUTION	Commission on California State Government Organization and Economy, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	Mar 87
CONTRACT	GOE-6001
NOTE	136p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Reference Materials - Directories/Catalogs (132)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Background; Catalogs; Child Abuse; *Child Neglect; *Child Welfare; *Delivery Systems; Homeless People; *Needs Assessment; Profiles; Program Improvement; Runaways; Social Problems; State Programs; *Welfare Services
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

Concerned because California now annually administers an estimated $5.9 billion in funding for children's services programs, the Little Hoover Commission initiated a study on the state's provision for children's services. This report, on Phase I of the study, identifies the extent of the problem in 23 findings and provides a plan of action in 15 recommendations for the development of viable solutions. Particular attention is given to neglected and abused children, runaway/homeless youth, and the need for child care services in California. Findings assert that (1) California's system for delivering children's services is in a state of confusion and disarray; (2) the present method of providing children's services results in service level inequities, disproportionate costs of services, wasted resources, and gaps in service delivery; (3) a great number of children desperately needing help are not being served; (4) several types of children's problems are occurring with an ever-greater frequency; and (5) the need for children's services and the demands of providers have dramatically increased due to recent economic and social changes. Appendices provide a list of advisory committee members, a list of state-funded programs providing children's services, and a catalog of state programs serving abused/neglected children, runaway/homeless youth, and children in need of child care services. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

STATE OF CALIFORNIA **GEORGE DEUKMEJIAN, *Governor***

COMMISSION ON CALIFORNIA STATE GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION AND ECONOMY
1127 - 11th Street, Suite 550, (916) 445-2125
Sacramento 95814

Chairman
NATHAN SHAPELL

Vice Chairman
JAMES M. BOUSKOS

ALFRED E. ALQUIST
Senator

MARY ANNE CHALKER

ALBERT GERSTEN JR

HAIG G. MARDIKIAN

MILTON MARKS
Senator

GWEN MOORE
Assemblywoman

M LESTER OSHEA

ABRAHAM SPIEGEL

RICHARD R. TERZIAN

JEAN KINDY WALKER

PHILLIP D. WYMAN
Assemblyman

ROBERT T. O'NEILL
Executive Director

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED280592

THE CHILDREN'S SERVICES DELIVERY SYSTEM IN CALIFORNIA

Preliminary Report - Phase I

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Robert T.
O'Neill
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PS 016432

MARCH 1987

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE CHILDREN'S SERVICES DELIVERY SYSTEM IN CALIFORNIA

Preliminary Report - Phase I

A Report of the
Commission on California State Government
Organization and Economy

"This report prepared pursuant to Contract No. GOE-6001
with Capitol Associates for $40,000"

MARCH 1987

STATE OF CALIFORNIA GEORGE DEUKMEJIAN, *Governor*

COMMISSION ON CALIFORNIA STATE GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION AND ECONOMY
1127 - 11th Street, Suite 550, (916) 445-2125
Sacramento 95814

Chairman
NATHAN SHAPELL

Vice Chairman
JAMES M. BOUSKOS

ALFRED E. ALQUIST
Senator

MARY ANNE CHALKER

ALBERT GERSTEN, JR.

HAIG G. MARDIKIAN

MILTON MARKS
Senator

GWEN MOORE
Assemblywoman

M. LESTER O'SHEA

ABRAHAM SPIEGEL

RICHARD R. TERZIAN

JEAN KINDY WALKER

PHILLIP D. WYMAN
Assemblyman

ROBERT T. O'NEILL
Executive Director

March 6, 1987

The Honorable George Deukmejian
Governor of California

The Honorable David A. Roberti
President pro Tempore of the Senate
and Members of the Senate

The Honorable James Nielsen
Senate Minority Floor Leader

The Honorable Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Speaker of the Assembly
and Members of the Assembly

The Honorable Patrick Nolan
Assembly Minority Floor Leader

Dear Governor and Members of the Legislature:

The Little Hoover Commission has conducted approximately 80 separate inquiries into State government activities in the Commission's 25 years of existence. These studies have chronicled numerous deficiencies in human services programs operated or administered by California State government, including serious problems in the State's nursing homes, substandard conditions in residential care facilities, and problems with the Medi-Cal program. While some of our previous studies have shocked and horrified members of the Commission, none have revealed more tragic problems of such broad magnitude than the Commission's current study of children's services in California.

In June 1986, the Little Hoover Commission initiated a study on the provision of children's services in California. The Commission undertook this study because it was concerned that the State now annually administers an estimated $5.9 billion in funding for children's services programs, exclusive of expenditures on the K-12 public school system. As part of the review, the Commission held public hearings in Los Angeles and San Francisco, visited children's services programs and facilities throughout the State, and utilized the services of a 33-member Blue Ribbon Advisory Committee to assist in fact finding.

The Commission's review revealed that California's children's services delivery system is in a state of utter confusion and disarray. It is comprised of a hodge podge of state and local agencies that are unable to effectively serve the growing number of youth in need of services because there is a vacuum of leadership, direction, and cooperation among children's services agencies.

(This letterhead not printed at taxpayer's expense)

Regrettably, at a time when public resources for children's services programs are at a premium, the present method of providing children's services results in tremendous inequities in service levels, disproportionate costs of services, wasted resources, and gaps in service delivery. While some children are fortunate enough to benefit from the State's current chaotic system of providing services, a greater number of children that desperately need help are not being served at all.

The tragedy of the inadequacies in the State's children's services system was revealed to the Commission in many ways, but none were more poignant nor more distressing than the faces of the many children throughout the State that are desperately in need of service. These included:

- The four-day old drug addicted baby in San Francisco General Hospital who was unable to be placed in foster care due to her fragile health;
- The 12-year old homeless street youth in Los Angeles who survived through a combination of criminal activity, prostitution, and drugs;
- The nine-year old latchkey child from Inglewood that returned home each day from school with a key around her neck and locked herself in her house in loneliness, fear, and isolation;
- The 11-year old chronic foster care child in Los Angeles who has "drifted" through numerous foster care placements and cannot be placed anywhere except in the county-operated "emergency" shelter;
- The six-month old infant with a broken wrist in a skid-row day care center in Los Angeles who would go hungry if the day care center that she attended did not provide meals for her; and
- The 17-year old youth from Fresno who has endured life-long beatings with broom sticks, having his head repeatedly pushed in a sink or toilet, and repeated sexual assaults since an early age.

Although some public officials would like to dismiss the circumstances that these children are confronting as isolated instances, a growing body of information indicates that rather than being merely exceptions, these types of children's problems are occurring with an ever-greater frequency. For example, our study found that:

- 645,000 of the 2.6 million preschool age children in California live in poverty;

- California had 60,627 cases of child abuse reported in 1985;
- California's foster care system serves approximately 32,000 children per month;
- There are an estimated 20,000 to 25,000 homeless youth in the State;
- 50 percent of homeless street youth engage in prostitution and 35 percent have used IV drugs;
- Only 7 percent of the 1.1 million children eligible for subsidized child care in the State receive it; and
- There are an estimated 1,000 latchkey children per zip code in Los Angeles County.

The Commission found that recent economic and social changes have dramatically increased the need for children's services and the demands on providers. Specifically, among the Commission's major findings are the following:

- Government's role in providing services to neglected and abused children is ambiguous. As a result, the child protective services delivery system is overburdened due to overwhelming number of reports of abuse, a lack of clearly defined priorities, and a critical lack of resources;
- The administrative problems in the delivery of children's services can result in inequities in the provision of services and the cost of services. For example, a neglected and abused child may be placed in a short-term county operated facility at a cost of $68,000 per year, or be placed in a foster care home at a cost of approximately $4,300 per year.
- The court system is experiencing difficulties in dealing with the number of cases of neglect and abuse. These delays further traumatize abused children by prolonging the ultimate placement decision;
- There is inadequate information regarding the outcomes of reported cases of neglect and abuse. Thus, the benefits of the current system for handling neglected and abused children and its cost effectives are difficult to determine;
- There is a severe shortage of foster care and other necessary services for all children especially those with special needs. This is primarily due to rate structures and reimbursement policies that do not fully consider the additional services these children need;

- There is an acute shortage of out-of-home care options that offer a supportive secure environment to the children who need them. As a result, children could be placed in an inappropriate situation without needed services;
- Runaway/homeless youth tend to "fall through the cracks" of public and private programs partly because there is a lack of understanding of these youths by the general population;
- Many models of treatment developed for neglected and abused children or youthful offenders do not suit the needs of homeless youth;
- California is experiencing an availability crisis in quality child care;
- High quality child development programs for disadvantaged children can result in significant long-term savings to the State; and
- The number of subsidized child care spaces available are insufficient to serve the working poor.

Furthermore, the Commission believes that if the children's crisis is left untreated, it will negatively effect the future economic and social well being of California. Therefore, the Commission believes that the State needs to take the following actions to address the current problems in the children's services system, including:

- The State should adopt a children's services policy that addresses the needs of the "whole" child;
- The State should develop an integrated and cohesive structure for delivering children's services;
- The State should encourage a coordinated systemwide network between state, local and private agencies;
- The State should assess the funding requirements to determine whether the level of funding is sufficient to meet the needs and fulfill the State's policy objectives; and
- The State should consider certain short-term and ultimate drastic long-term changes in how it administers its child protective service system.

Because of the magnitude of the problem, the Commission elected to conduct the study in two phases. Phase I, which is concluded by the release of this report, identifies the extent of the problem and provides a plan of action for the development of viable solutions. Phase II, which will be completed this fall, will contain the detailed recommendations for improving the children's delivery system.

The Commission believes that without a drastic rethinking and restructuring of our State's children's services delivery system, a significant portion of our next generation of children will not be able to assume responsible roles as productive members of society. Moreover, many of these youths ultimately will end up being supported by the State in its criminal justice institutions, welfare system, state hospitals, and other state-supported care facilities and programs.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Kindy Walker

JEAN KINDY WALKER, Chair
Children's Services Study
Subcommittee

Albert Gersten, Jr.
Haig Mardikian
Abraham Spiegel

Nathan Shapell, Chairman
James M. Bouskos, Vice Chairman
Senator Alfred Alquist
Mary Anne Chalker
Senator Milton Marks
Assemblywoman Gwen Moore
M. Lester Oshea*
Richard Terzian
Assemblyman Phillip Wyman*

*Dissent

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY i

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Impact of the Problem 1
Factors Underlying the Problem 2
Scope and Methodology 3
Study Constraints and Considerations 4
Report Format 5

II. PRINCIPAL UNDERLYING PROBLEMS IN THE CHILDREN'S SERVICES DELIVERY SYSTEM 6

Background 6
Poorly Defined Roles and Responsibilities 9
Fragmented System Services 9
Inequitable and Ineffective Distribution of Funds 12

III. NEGLECTED AND ABUSED CHILDREN 14

Historical Trends in Providing Services 14

Finding #1: Government's Role in Providing Services to Neglected and Abused Children is Ambiguous 15

Finding #2: Lack of Direction and Coordination of Services for Neglected and Abused and Children 17

Finding #3: The Court System is Experiencing Difficulties in Dealing with the Number of Cases of Neglect and Abuse 19

Finding #4: Current Approaches to Investigating Allegations of Abuse and Neglect may Prove Damaging to Families and Children 19

Finding #5: Increased Number of Reports of Child Abuse and Neglect Combined with Resources Have Contributed to Workload Problems 20

Finding #6: Lack of Comprehensive Training and Procedural Guidelines for Conducting Investigations 22

Finding #7: Inadequate Information Regarding the Outcomes of Reported Cases of Abuse and Neglect 23

Finding #8: Shortages of Adequate Services to Abused and Neglected Children with Special Needs 24

Finding #9: Lack of Adequate Placement Resources to Serve Neglected and Abused Children Who Need Out-Of-Home Care 25

IV. RUNAWAY/HOMELESS YOUTH 28

Finding #10: The Problems of Ruanway/Homeless Youth Are Not Fully Recognized 28

Finding #11: Runaway/Homeless Youth Tend to "Fall Through the Cracks" of Public and Private Programs 30

Finding #12: Models of Treatment Developed for Abused and Neglected Children or Youthful Offenders Generally do not Suit the Needs of Homeless Youth 33

Finding #13: Family Reunification is not a Realistic Goal for Many Runaway/Homeless Youth 34

Finding #14: Impediments Exist to Providing Services To Runaway/Homeless Youth at the Local Level 35

V. NEED FOR CHILD CARE SERVICES IN CALIFORNIA 38

Background 38

Finding #15: Child Care has Become a Necessity for Working Families 39

Finding #16: California is Experiencing an Availability Crisis in Quality Child Care 40

Finding #17: High Quality Child Development Programs For Disadvantaged Children Can Result in Significant Long-Term Savings for the State 41

Finding #18: Major Factors Exist that Affect the Quality of Child Care 42

Finding #19: Skyrocketing Insurance Costs Could Reduce the Number of Children Served and the Quality of Child Care Programs 44

Finding #20: Lack of Consistent Goals and Guidelines for Child Care Services 44

Finding #21: The Number of Subsidized Child Care Spaces Available are Insufficient to Serve the Working Poor 46

Finding #22: The Administrative Requirements for the Quality and Cost of Providing Child Care Have Not Been Reconciled 47

Finding #23: The Child Care Needs of Special Population Groups are not Being Met 50

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDED PLAN OF ACTION 53

Conclusions 53

Recommendations 54

Plan of Action 61

APPENDICES

Appendix A - Listing of Members of the Blue Ribbon Advisory Committee 63

Appendix B - Listing of State Funded Programs Providing Children's Services 65

Appendix C - Catalog of State Government Programs Serving Abused and Neglected Children, Runaway/Homeless Youth, and Children in Need of Child Care Services 68

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

California has a large and rapidly expanding children's population. Presently there are approximately 6.9 million children under 18 years of age in the State. Between 1980 and 1985, the State's population of infants and young children under six years of age increased by 25 percent. Moreover, the projected number of births is expected to remain at this higher level for the rest of the century.

The rapid rise in the number of children in the State combined with sweeping social and economic changes in California during the past 40 years have resulted in dramatic changes in family patterns, including an increased number of households headed by single parents and a greater number of women working in the labor force. In fact, the "traditional family," with a working father and a mother at home with the children, is becoming a modern day dinosaur.

Unfortunately, the demographic, economic, and social changes in California have had a severe impact on the ability of many parents to provide adequate nutrition, shelter, and medical care for their children. For example, the number of children living in poverty has doubled over the last six years. Nearly one-half of the young children who live in poverty live in homes headed by women. In addition, among three- to five-year olds living with single mothers, the incidence of poverty is 57 percent and among children under three it is 78 percent.

The rapid transformation that has taken place in family patterns has increased the need and demand for publicly-funded children's services in California. As these needs and demands have evolved, the State of California has responded by adding a host of individual programs, organizational units, and funding sources to address specific problems and concerns. This incremental growth in children's services agencies and programs over a period of time has resulted in a delivery system in California that is unmanageable and disjointed.

California presently administers more than $5.9 billion annually to provide a wide variety of services for children in need, exclusive of the more than $15 billion annually that the State spends on its kindergarten through grade 12 public school system. Approximately $1.2 billion of the $5.9 billion is spent by the State to fund 35 different programs for neglected and abused children, homeless children, and children in need of child care services.

The Commission's study revealed that California's children's services delivery system is in a state of utter confusion and disarray. It is administered by a hodge podge of state and local agencies that are unable to effectively serve the growing number of youth in need of services. Moreover, due to a vacuum of leadership, direction, and cooperation among children's services agencies, there are tremendous inequities in service levels, disproportionate costs of services, inefficient use of resources, and gaps in service delivery.

The disproportionate costs of services provided by the State's children's services delivery system is best exemplified by the varying types of treatment a neglected and abused child may receive. For example, a neglected and abused child may be placed in a short-term county operated group facility where, due to the lack of available foster care homes, the child may remain indefinitely at an annual cost of approximately $68,000 per year. In contrast, a similar neglected and abused child may end up in a licensed foster care home at an annual cost of approximately $4,300.

The lack of direction and sound organization in the children's services delivery system is nowhere as painfully evident as in the tremendous confusion and waste of resources that is occurring in the state's child protective system. For example, the "assembly line" approach to investigating allegations of child abuse that the counties in the State are now using may involve as many as 22 separate interviews with different child welfare professionals. Besides being lengthy, exhaustive, and potentially traumatic to a child and his or her family, it is an extremely duplicative process that unnecessarily wastes the relatively limited resources available for children's services.

Due to the fragmented organization for serving children in California, there are also numerous gaps in the provision of services. For example, while portions of the Welfare and Institutions Code are designed to address the problems relating to neglected and abused youth and status offenders, there is no state agency charged with providing services for runaway/homeless youths. As a result, although at least 75 percent of the hard-core "street kids" engage in either criminal activity, drugs, or prostitution to support themselves, there are no statewide programs to help these youths.

The tremendous inequity in the provision of children's services in the State is starkly demonstrated in the area of subsidized child care. The State Department of Education funds approximately 90,000 full-time spaces for children whose parents qualify for the State's child care subsidy. However, a recent study conducted by a private non-profit child development organization indicated that for every child in Los Angeles County receiving subsidized child care, there are seven to eight children whose parents are equally or more needy and do not receive State supported child care services.

Without a dramatic rethinking and restructuring of our State's children's services delivery system, a significant portion of our next generation of children will not be able to assume responsible roles as productive members of society. Moreover, many of these youths ultimately will end up in the State's criminal justice institutions, the welfare systems, state hospitals, or other state-supported care facilities and programs.

The Commission's preliminary report presents the results of Phase 1 of a two-part study. Specifically, Phase 1 focused on identifying the major problems in the delivery of services to children in California. The preliminary report summarizes the 23 findings and 15 recommendations for improving the system. The recommendations include the following:

1. The State should adopt a uniform children's services policy that addresses the needs of the whole child.

2. The State should develop an integrated and cohesive structure for delivering children's services.
3. The State should encourage a coordinated network between state, local and private agencies for delivering children's services.
4. The State should consider short-term changes to allow the current system to function more effectively.
5. The State should rethink and restructure the method it uses to administer the child protective services system.
6. The State should encourage the development of child care facilities.

Phase II of the study will begin immediately and will result in a final report which will be issued in August 1987. This report will contain a detailed review of each of the long-term recommendations and an implementation plan.

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

California's children's services delivery system is in a state of utter confusion and disarray. It is administered by a hodge podge of State and local agencies that are unable to effectively serve the growing number of youth in need of services because there is a vacuum of leadership, direction, and cooperation among children's service agencies. Frequently, these agencies have conflicting priorities and are constrained by the cumulative impact of numerous administrative, financial and legal requirements.

Regrettably, at a time when public resources for children's services programs are at a premium, the present method of providing children's services results in tremendous inequities in service levels, disproportionate costs of services, wasted resources, and gaps in service delivery. While some children are fortunate enough to benefit from the State's current chaotic system of providing services, a greater number of children that desperately need help are not being served at all.

Without a dramatic rethinking and restructuring of our State's children's services delivery system, a significant portion of our next generation of children will not be able to assume responsible roles as productive members of society. Moreover, many of these youths ultimately will end up being supported by the State in its criminal justice institutions, welfare system, State hospitals, and other State-supported care facilities and programs.

IMPACT OF THE PROBLEM

The Commission's study identified the large magnitude and broad impact of the problems throughout the children's services delivery system. One of the most devastating examples that our Commission identified of the system failing children in need was the June 1986 death of Nathan Moncrieff. Nathan was a 14-month old toddler who, after recovering from surgery, was removed from a loving emergency foster care home and placed in a permanent foster home in April 1986. This permanent foster care "family" was selected, in part, because they intended to adopt the small boy.

However, on June 13, 1986, Nathan was brought to the Children's Hospital in Oakland by his new foster parents where he died. The hospital staff determined that Nathan had been systematically abused and had died of head injuries after being beaten with a shoe. Authorities later determined that the foster "parents" were in fact a male transvestite and his lover, whom at the time of placement was being sought by police. What is even more tragic is that the initial foster mother who had nurtured Nathan for one year throughout his recovery from surgery had tried to adopt him, but was told that she was too old.

The Commission also identified many instances of the ineffective and inadequate services available for homeless youth. For example, a youth named Carlos testified at one of our public hearings. Carlos had a history of being sexually abused by an older brother and was regularly physically abused by his mother. He had run away from home twice, experienced two foster home failures, and had been through court proceedings initiated against his abusive mother. Despite these experiences, he managed to graduate from high school and ended up on the streets of Fresno, at the age of 17--"too young to get on welfare and too old to ask someone to take care of me." Since Carlos moved to San Francisco he has found himself bouncing between the ranks of the "homeless," temporary housing programs, and shared apartments.

"I did get myself together from a street kid to someone responsible enough to, hopefully, some day have his own apartment," Carlos stated. "But I do feel cheated. I do feel as though where it was supposed to be the best years of my life and the most happiest times, it wasn't."

Although Carlos' story is bleak, it is important to remember that he is far more fortunate than most homeless youth. He has survived and is somewhat optimistic about his future. He has not become a victim of drug abuse and prostitution and is not resorting to crime to support himself.

The Commission also identified problems in the affordability and availability of quality child care in the State. For example, at one of our public hearings, the Commission heard testimony regarding a mother who previously had her child in a preschool child care center. The preschool eventually was closed by the State Department of Social Services because the husband and wife running the school were taking pictures of the preschool children in the nude. The mother reported that her daughter, age 3, had told her about this. The mother believed the daughter and removed the child from school. The mother then used her two-week vacation from work to look for available and affordable child care. However, at the end of the two weeks, the mother was unable to find another child care center. As a result, the mother re-enrolled her child in the same preschool.

FACTORS UNDERLYING THE PROBLEM

California has a sizeable population of children that is growing rapidly and who potentially will require various children's services at some time during their childhood. There are presently approximately 6.9 million children under 18 years of age in California. Between 1980 and 1985 the population of infants and young children under six years old increased by 25 percent. Furthermore, the number of births is expected to remain at this higher level for the rest of the century.

In recent decades, the Government has played a significant role in providing or facilitating services for children in need. The need for government to play a leadership role in ensuring that children are adequately cared for has been accentuated in recent years due to social and economic pressures that have contributed to the breakup of traditional families. This has resulted in an increased number of households headed by divorced women and an increased number of children living in poverty. The necessity of government playing a vital role to ensure that our children are adequately cared for can be demonstrated by the following statistics:

- In a national study on child abuse, California led the nation in the number of reported cases in 1982;
- In California in 1984, there were 31,396 births to mothers aged 18 or younger;
- It is estimated that there may be as many as 1.1 million "latchkey" children between the ages of 6 and 14 in this state.
- Various estimates indicate that there are between 20,000 and 25,000 homeless youth under the age of 18 in California;
- It is estimated that there may be as many as 2 million children in California ranging in age from infants through school age who need child care space, yet there is only licensed space for 500,000 children.

Californians and the rest of the nation have become increasingly aware of the extent of the children's services problem and have shown a desire to address it. For example, a national survey by Louis Harris in August 1986 indicated that 63 percent of the people polled said that we are spending too little effort on the problems of children. In addition, 54 percent believed that government is spending too little on programs for children. Furthermore, the majority of people surveyed stated a willingness to pay more taxes to support children's services.

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

In June 1986, Chairman Shapell and members of the Commission initiated the study of the provision of children's services in California. At that time, Chairman Shapell appointed Commissioner Jean Kindy Walker as the Chairman of the Subcommittee responsible for overseeing the detailed study fieldwork. In addition, Commissioners Abraham Spiegel, Haig Mardikian, and Albert Gersten were appointed as members of the Subcommittee.

The intent of the study was to look at the system of service delivery for neglected and abused children, runaway/homeless youths, and children in need of child care. Because of the complexity of the issues being reviewed, the Commission recruited 33 people that were identified as leaders in the field of children's services to participate on a "Blue Ribbon Advisory Committee" to provide the technical expertise for the study. Appendix A provides a listing of the members of the Committee. In addition, Capitol Associates, a private consulting firm, was selected as a consultant to provide technical assistance for the study.

The role of the Blue Ribbon Advisory Committee was to assist the Commission and its technical consultant to do the following:

- o Identify resources in the State committed to children's services;
- o Review and critique the study methodology; and
- o Assist in the identification of major problems and issue areas and help identify potential solutions.

The study has been divided into two phases. Phase I involves the collection and review of information regarding the current children's services delivery system in the State and the identification of major problems and issues. In addition, Phase I identified some short-term recommendations requiring immediate action. This report presents the results of Phase I of the study.

Phase II of the study will include additional detailed review relating to major problems and issue areas. Phase II also will involve the development of a complete set of final recommendations for addressing the problems and issues identified in the study. The Phase II report is scheduled to be released in August 1987.

As part of the study, the Commission held two public hearings, one in Los Angeles on July 30, 1986 and one in San Francisco on September 25, 1986. At these hearings, the Commission received testimony from numerous experts and members of the public regarding system deficiencies. In addition, members of the Commission and staff conducted site visits at children's services providers throughout the State and worked with the Senate Select Committee on Children and Youth. The public hearings were supplemented by research conducted by the Commission staff and the consultants.

STUDY CONSTRAINTS AND CONSIDERATIONS

The statistical information contained in the report regarding the survey of State-funded programs was based on the information provided by the specific State agencies. While the Commission has reviewed the data for reasonableness, the Commission did not verify the complete accuracy of the data.

Although the Commission recognizes that treatment programs and services may not be adequate to meet the needs of other members of the "at risk" population, such as medically fragile infants and pregnant teenagers, our study sought to identify overall problems in the children's services delivery system by focusing on three major populations; neglected and abused children, runaway/homeless youths, and children in need of child care.

While the Commission's study identified major problems in California's children's services delivery system, the study also revealed that there are many dedicated professionals working in children's services in California. These professionals have been working long and hard hours serving increasingly large caseloads with minimal support and resources. We would like to acknowledge their efforts and point out that some of these dedicated professionals are also becoming victims of burn out, frustration, and despair due to the resource allocation and constraint problems in California's children's services program.

The Commission would like to express its appreciation to the members of the Blue Ribbon Advisory Committee that worked on this study. Their insight, candor, and diligence in discussing the problems and issues relating to the State's children's services system greatly enhanced and expedited the Commission's study. Finally, the Commission would like to express its thanks to the Senate Select Committee on Children and Youth for its help in developing the finding and recommendations for the neglected and abused section of this report.

REPORT FORMAT

The report is presented in six chapters. The next chapter of the report, Chapter II, provides background information and an overview of children's services in California. Chapter III discusses the problems in the system designed to serve neglected and abused children. Chapter IV presents information on the problems in the service delivery system for runaway/homeless youth. Chapter V discusses the problems serving children in need of child care. Finally, Chapter VI presents the Commission's study conclusions and recommendations. It also presents a plan of action for Phase II of the study which will include the development of more detailed recommendations to address the problems in the State's children's services delivery system that have been identified in this study.

CHAPTER II
PRINCIPAL UNDERLYING PROBLEMS IN THE CHILDREN'S SERVICES DELIVERY SYSTEM

The baby boom of the 1980s combined with the social and economic pressures of recent years have resulted in a startling number of young children living in poverty. Unfortunately, even though approximately $5.9 billion of funding is administered by the State each year for children's services, the State's fragmented delivery system is not equipped to deal with the large numbers of children requiring services. This occurred because the current children's services system is uncoordinated and does not have well-defined responsibilities. As a result, no single agency has responsibility for providing the full range of services needed by many children.

BACKGROUND

In 1980, one out of every five California children under the age of six lived in poverty. However, by 1986, one out of four, or 645,000 of the 2.6 million preschool children in the State, lived in poverty. Given the dramatic growth in the number of children due to the baby boom of the 1980s, the number of children living in poverty has doubled in the last six years. These grim statistics are due, in part, to the large number of additional young children in the State coupled with social and economic changes of the past few years.

Economic and social changes have resulted in changing family patterns that have affected the ability of larger numbers of children to obtain adequate nutrition, shelter and medical care within a loving environment. Many young couples have accommodated the economic changes by becoming dual wage-earning households, delaying or foregoing the purchase of a home, or having smaller families. These social and economic pressures have contributed to the breakup of many families and resulted in an increased number of households headed by single parents. The "traditional" family, with a working father and a mother at home with the children, is becoming the dinosaur of the 1980s.

Exhibit II.1 on the following page, illustrates the evolution of families with children by family type during the past 40 years. Specifically, it shows that families with children headed by single females comprise a rapidly expanding number of California households, having increased by more than 742 percent from 1940 to 1980. Even more alarming is the fact that families headed by single black females exhibited an astounding growth rate of over 4,000 percent and families headed by single females with Spanish surnames increased by 1552 percent during this same period. This, coupled with social and economic factors that place a disproportionate number of women in the low income level, illustrates the feminization of poverty during the last 40 years.

The 1980 census data showed that close to seven percent of all households were headed by single females. However, single females with children comprised over 45 percent of the households with income in the lowest quintile and 36 percent of the households with income below the median range.

Exhibit II.1

ANALYSIS OF FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN IN CALIFORNIA BY FAMILY TYPE FROM 1940 TO 1980

(Numbers in Thousands)

	Census Year					
Family Type	**1940**	**1950**	**1960**	**1970**	**1980**	**Percent Change 1940 to 1980**
Couple	691.7	1,669.1	2,061.8	2,347.6	2,410.5	248
Single Female	67.6	105.1	200.3	381.0	569.6	742
Single Female (Black)	2.6	10.7	25.2	68.1	118.5	4,457
Single Female (Spanish Surname)	6.0	12.9	21.3	48.0	99.1	1,552
Single Male	16.1	18.7	27.9	57.0	100.8	526

SOURCE: Created from data appearing in Socio-Economic Trends in California: 1940-1980, California Employment Development Department, 1986.

To further demonstrate the effect social and economic changes have had on children, Exhibit II.2 shows the number of children by family type in California over the last four decades. Specifically, it illustrates that the number of single parents increased 656 percent while the number of children living with two adults increased only 256 percent.

Consistent with the growth in single-parent families, there also has been a substantial increase in the number of children living in single-parent households. Moreover, a large percentage of these single-parent households are living in poverty. For example, nearly one-half of the young children who live in poverty live in homes headed by women. In addition, among 3 to 5 year olds living with single mothers, the incidence of poverty is 57 percent and among children under three it is 78 percent.

Exhibit II.2

ANALYSIS OF THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN BY FAMILY TYPE
IN CALIFORNIA FROM 1940 TO 1980

(Numbers in Millions)

Family Type	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	Percent Change 1940-80
Couple	1.37	3.84	4.77	5.44	4.88	256
Single Parent	0.16	0.29	0.49	0.97	1.21	656

SOURCE: Created from data appearing in Socio-Economic Trends in California: 1940-1980, California Employment Development Department, 1986.

Changes in family patterns have increased the need for the provision of publicly-funded services. These needs have developed piece-by-piece and have resulted in a broad yet often unarticulated public responsibility to respond to the needs of the child. Thus, the programs established to fulfill these often ill-defined responsibilities have been designed, organized, funded and operated within narrow limitations that prevent any one entity from assuming responsibility for the "whole child."

POORLY DEFINED ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Many of the problems in the children's delivery system reflect ambiguities in State law concerning the roles of public agencies and their responsibilities for providing publicly-funded services for children. With a wide variety of programs each operating with their own mandates, priorities, and constraints, it is often difficult to tell where the responsibilities of one agency end and another's begins. This lack of clarity extends to:

- Determining standards for, methods of, and limits for intervening on the behalf of potentially endangered children;
- Identifying the appropriate scope and duration of child welfare services;
- Determining financial responsibility for providing services to "homeless" youth;
- Identifying where responsibility lies for providing child care services;
- Providing financial responsibility for out-of-home care for children; and
- Determining the appropriate use of private sector resources and the role of private employers.

Imprecise definitions of government responsibilities and unclear limitation on services invite unrealistic expectations for public programs. In this situation, local entities and private service providers are able to assert with considerable credibility that the State does not adequately fund its mandates. For example, the State requires specific types of services that should be provided to abused and neglected children and their families. However, the State does not appropriate or allocate funds specifically for each required service. Thus, there is no way to equate the statutory requirement for service, the need in any given county, and the dollars appropriated to satisfy the requirement. As a result, the lack of clarity of public agency roles, responsibilities, and functions severely hampers the ability of the public sector to provide service and the ability of the private sector to supplement public mandates.

FRAGMENTED SYSTEM SERVICES

Like many human service systems, programs for children are designed, funded and administered "compartmentally" at the federal and State levels. However, local entities, mainly the counties, are expected to operate these programs in a manner that is responsive to the multiple needs of individuals. In many instances, human service programs have been established in this compartmentalized fashion for historical reasons. For example, the establishment of a specific program with its own requirements and guidelines provides a governmental agency with the ability to control or restrict the funding of various types of services. It also provides a governmental agency with the ability to better predict and control expenditures.

The piecemeal growth of compartmentalized programs has led to problems in service delivery, many of which are evident in the provision of children's services in California. Difficulties in finding and obtaining the appropriate range of services needed by a child or family, accounts of children "falling through the cracks" of the service system, and the inability to hold any individual or agency accountable for the results of services are the chronic symptoms of a fragmented service system.

To gain insight into this problem, the Commission developed a survey requesting program information for all State programs serving neglected and abused children, runaway/homeless youth, and children in need of child care. APPENDIX B contains the complete results of the survey. The survey revealed that six State entities and all three segments of public post-secondary operate and/or fund services for children in one or more of each of these three categories.

Exhibit II.3 summarizes the results of the survey and shows the State expenditures and reported caseloads for neglected and abused children, runaway/homeless youth, and children in need of care. This exhibit illustrates the dimension of the State's specific services for the three groups. For example, nine entities administer 35 programs and expend more than $1.2 billion to conduct activities

However, identifiable expenditures for all State programs specifically designed for children, including the $1.2 million for neglected and abused children, runaway/homeless youth, and children in need of child care, exceed $5.9 billion annually before considering K-12 education funding. The expenditures for these programs are presented in Appendix C.

There are many State-operated and State-supported programs that expend resources to serve children who may also be abused and neglected, runaway/homeless, or in need of child care. However, such children are not specifically identified as abused or neglected, homeless, or in need of child care in statewide statistics. Thus, although individual service providers may know children in their caseloads who fit these definitions, these children are not included in formal statistics maintained by State-operated or State-supported programs. This further demonstrates the lack of coordination of services and reporting at the State level.

Exhibit II.3

ANALYSIS OF PROGRAMS AND EXPENDITURES BY STATE AGENCIES FOR NEGLECTED AND ABUSED CHILDREN, HOMELESS CHILDREN AND CHILDREN IN NEED OF CHILD CARE

Department/ Organization	Target Group	Number of Programs	Fiscal Year 1986/87 Expenditures	Caseload
Social Services	Abuse/Neglect	6	$765,578,000	142,473
	Child Care	4	67,005,000	52,300
Education	Child Care	13	366,953,000	84,985
Office of Criminal Justice Planning	Abuse/Neglect	3	1,284,000	4,050
	Homeless	2	1,120,000	3,000
Housing and Community Development	Homeless	1	3,880,000	Unknown
Child Development Programs Advisory Committee	Child Care	1	216,000	N/A
Justice	Abuse/Neglect	1	700,000	N/A
University of California System	Child Care	1	3,502,000	877*
California State University	Child Care	1	3,466,000	1,800*
Community Colleges	Child Care	1	4,026,000	6,000*
		1	736,000	3,000*
TOTALS		35	$1,218,466,000	298,485

NOTES:

* Caseloads may be duplicated in the data reported by the Department of Education.

Additionally, the private sector also plays a significant role in delivering services to all three groups. Many of the State-supported programs rely on contracts with private entities to provide services. Some of these contracts are administered at the State level, while others are administered by local agencies. In addition, many private agencies such as those funded through the United Way provide funding for children's services in California.

For example, during 1986, the United Way provided direct funding totaling at least $2.46 million for child care facilities, $2.10 million for services to neglected and abused children, and $1.1 million for services to homeless youth. In addition, as part of the United Way's contribution to individual communities, millions of additional dollars are provided for children's services.

Based upon the information that the Commission gathered on the number of agencies, programs, and the amount of funds going for children's services in California, it is obvious that California has made children's services a high priority issue. However, the complexities of the system, the unclear roles and responsibilities, and the fragmented delivery of services, have a negative impact on the cost-effectiveness of the services being provided.

INEQUITABLE AND INEFFECTIVE DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDING

The funding available for the children's services delivery system in California is frequently distributed in an unequitable manner that is not cost effective. A good example of this problem is the different ways that various locales in the State use to serve neglected and abused children and the significant variation in costs of services provided. For example, our study showed that if a child is physically abused in California, depending on the availability of foster care and the services in the county that the child lives in, any one of the following placement decisions could be made by the social worker for the same child:

- The child could be sent to a county hospital where, due to a shortage of foster care openings, the child could remain at a cost of up to $1,000 per day, or an annual cost of $365,000 per year; or

- The child could be placed in a county operated "short-term" placement home where, due to a shortage of foster care openings, the child could remain indefinitely at a cost of $186 per day or an annual cost of $68,000 per year; or

- The child could be placed in a foster care home at a cost of $340 per month or an annual cost of $4,080 per year; or

- The child could run away from home and could be living on the streets. This child could potentially be served at a community-based crisis counseling center at an annual cost of $800 per year while being forced to support himself or herself.

These examples illustrate that due to the inequitable service delivery system and the lack of cost effective treatment alternatives, the number of dollars spent on children's services may not correlate with the severity of the child's problem or the quality of treatment. Although the availability of resources is a major concern and will be a major focus in Phase II of our study, a rethinking and restructuring of the system to provide coordination and leadership must be addressed before the adequacy of resources can be fully assessed.

CHAPTER III
NEGLECTED AND ABUSED CHILDREN

California's children's protective service system for neglected and abused children is being engulfed by a dramatic rise in the number of reports of abuse and neglect. This is primarily due to recent changes in legislation and an increasing awareness by the State's citizenry to the plight of neglected and abused children. This awareness has created tremendous expectations on the child protective service system. Unfortunately, the increased demands on the system combined with a lack of availability of needed services and the uncoordinated system have caused havoc. As a result, there has been an outcry for change by all who come in contact with the system, including children, parents, social workers, and law enforcement officials.

HISTORICAL TRENDS IN PROVIDING SERVICES

Current policies for neglected and abused children have evolved from a long history of social welfare policies and practices. Historically, responses to the question of what to do with neglected and abused children have ranged from the 18th Century practice of "binding out," or indenturing such children in servitude, to the 19th Century use of orphanages and reformatories. These practices were forerunners to our present system of utilizing foster care and a variety of other support services for neglected and abused children.

Until the 1930's, most of the programs available to neglected and abused children were provided and funded by local charities. Demographic shifts, combined with the crisis of the Great Depression, prompted the beginning of federal funding for children's services. Due to the leadership of social reformers, the idea of foster home care became the prescribed alternative for children without parental care because of the family environment it could offer children.

Encouraged, in part, by federal financial incentives, states across the nation established child protective services. This involvement grew as the ideological commitment to the "War on Poverty" in the 1960's and early 1970's further expanded the role of government in social services. For example, California passed its first Child Abuse Reporting Law in 1963.

As the system that provides child protective services has expanded, so have the problems. One of these problems involves a debate concerning the type and extent of sanctions against parents who neglect and/or abuse their children. While one side of this debate urges that these parents be tried and locked up as criminals, the other side argues that they should be offered support services, such as counseling, to better enable them to perform their parental responsibilities.

A second problem concerns what the role of different levels of government should be in the provision of child protective services. These roles have fluctuated over time. For example, from roughly 1974 to 1980, the federal government shouldered a large part of the legal and financial responsibilities toward child protective services. During this time, California required that counties provide the necessary 25 percent match to obtain federal Title XX funds. Largely because of the limited amount of State funds involved, counties had a great deal of flexibility in the provision of programs.

Financial constraints at the local level caused by Proposition 13, coupled with a 21.6 percent reduction in federal Title XX funds, as well as other federal cuts, prompted confusion concerning how to continue the needed services in the late 1970s and early 1980s. The State ultimately ended up increasing funding, in part, by assuming the responsibility for the increased matching funds necessary to retain federal dollars. The increase in State funding to county programs exacerbated the ambiguity regarding how much flexibility counties have over programs and how much authority and responsibility rests with the State.

A third problem relates to the most appropriate method of care for neglected and abused children. Specifically, concerns arose regarding the importance of preventative services and permanency planning to combat the practice of a child experiencing "foster care drift", i.e., shuffling from one foster home to another. This spawned concerns about the over-use of foster care. However, this concern had to be mitigated by the federal funding stipulations that encouraged foster care placements.

These problems combined with changes in federal law led to the 1982 enactment of Senate Bill 14 (SB 14). SB 14 increased the authority of the State over local services by dictating more prescriptive regulations and procedures. Additionally, the bill sought to provide more immediate attention to children in need and encourage alternatives to foster care placement. SB 14 also stressed the importance of family reunification or permanency planning.

FINDING #1: GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN PROVIDING SERVICES TO NEGLECTED AND ABUSED CHILDREN IS AMBIGUOUS.

California made major changes in State law in 1982 for serving neglected and abused children through the enactment of SB 14. While the law addressed some specific problems in the delivery of services to neglected and abused children, it created considerable confusion regarding the type and extent of treatment services that should be provided. There is an overwhelming number of reports of abuse, a lack of clearly defined priorities for providing service, and a critical lack of resources. As a result, California's child protective services system is overburdened. In essence, California's child protective service system has become the system of "last resort" for children in need of services. Due to high public expectations and the ambiguous service requirements under the law, there is tremendous dissatisfaction with the current system for serving neglected and abused children.

In 1963, California's first Child Abuse Reporting Law, Penal Code, Article 2.5, was enacted. After subsequent amendments, this law now requires that school employees, medical personnel, child care workers, child welfare workers and all others who work with children immediately report all cases of suspected child abuse. Specifically, this law requires that prescribed reports be filed with child protective agencies within 36 hours. Law enforcement and/or child welfare agencies must investigate the reports and copies must be provided to the Attorney General. A central registry of such complaints is maintained in Sacramento by the Department of Justice.

The Legislature enacted SB 14 in 1982 in response to changes in federal law and widespread concern about the over-use of foster placement. In addition, the Legislature was concerned with the long delays in handling incidents of neglect and abuse that reduced the chances of family reunification. SB 14 made the following changes to State law:

- Required an immediate in-person response to all reports of neglect or abuse;

- Increased legal standards governing removal of children from their homes;

- Required the provision of protective and support services for the purpose of preventing separation of children from their families;

- Required courts to make a timely determination regarding permanent placement for the child. Adoption is the first priority for placement, followed by guardianship and long-term foster care; and

- Required welfare departments to maintain written case plans for each child and to facilitate periodic worker/child contacts.

Despite the good intentions of the law, in many ways SB 14 has compounded managerial problems at the local level. A large part of these managerial problems is due to the fact that SB 14 placed additional burdens on local agencies. For example, the immediate investigative requirements in SB 14 require local agencies to devote time to investigate some reports that could be determined false without an in-person visit. Additionally, the time constraints for making determinations coupled with the increased number of reports may prompt local agencies to make hasty decisions that actually encourage unnecessary temporary foster care placements.

Our Commission heard testimony regarding the numerous vagaries resulting in the current system of handling neglected and abused children. For example, as an apparent side affect of chicken pox, 3-year old Helen Gray developed a vaginal infection. Helen's mother brought her to a doctor who reported the case to authorities as a possible sign of sexual molestation. The following day, little Helen was forcibly removed from her parents' home and placed at MacLaren Hall in Los Angeles. It took over two months for the charges to be dropped.

Another example of problems in the current system is the case of the Evans family. After learning that his sons, ages 10 and 5, had been sexually abused by his former wife, Mr. Evans obtained custody.

Children's protective services refused to prosecute the boy's mother for the abuse, despite requests from Mr. Evans. After depleting his savings on psychiatric care for the children, Mr. Evans went to a county mental health agency for help. He was told that the county could provide intensive help for the children if he relinquished custody. The children were placed in a foster care home where the foster mother had recently married one of her former foster care children. Furthermore, while in the foster home, the children did not receive the support services they desperately needed. The natural mother later obtained temporary custody of the boys and moved to West Virginia where she is now being investigated for molesting the children again.

Although the names have been changed, these cases were two of numerous complaints that came to the Commission's attention during the study. These complaints included ones from parents who related painful experiences of unfounded accusations of abuse. They also included complaints from social workers who told of problems in the system as well as work-related problems that prevented them from adequately performing their job of helping children in need. Underlying these complaints is the stark reality that thousands of California's children are being neglected and abused each year. The scars that can be left if the situation is left unchecked can show up years later in the form of school dropout, substance abuse, chronic unemployment, criminal behavior, or the abuse or neglect of their own children.

One of the major problems with existing law is that all reports of abuse and neglect must be investigated to the same degree, including a face-to-face interview. The lack of an initial risk assessment procedure for evaluating and assigning priorities to reported cases of abuse severely handicaps social workers' ability to respond to all cases in an appropriate manner.

FINDING #2: LACK OF DIRECTION AND COORDINATION OF SERVICES FOR NEGLECTED AND ABUSED CHILDREN.

Coordination of services for neglected and abused children at the State and local levels is not effective due to ambiguous mandates for services, different funding sources, conflicting eligibility requirements and historic "territorial" boundaries. The lack of direction and coordination of existing resources has had a negative impact on the overall level of performance of children's services. This is particularly true for multi-problem children and youth whose treatment needs can easily encompass the mental health system, the juvenile justice system, substance abuse programs, the education system, physical health services, and the social welfare system.

The children's services system in California is administered by numerous departments at the State level. Thus, there is not one State agency which has the authority to fully provide the multitude of services needed by neglected and abused children. The State Department of Social Services administers the Child Welfare Services Program, which includes program oversight of services provided by county welfare departments. Complications arise out of the fact that many of the services needed by neglected and abused children are under the jurisdiction of other agencies of State government, such as the Department of Mental Health, the Department of Alcohol and Drug Abuse, the Department of Developmental Services, the Department of Health Services, and the Office of Criminal Justice Planning.

The problem of providing continuing services to neglected and abused children is particularly difficult at the local level because local agencies lack the authority to assure the provision of services across agency boundaries. This arrangement precludes adequate case management and operational control of individual cases and programs. As a result, many neglected and abused children do not receive potentially effective services because no single agency has continuing responsibility.

At least one current demonstration project has been designed to test new models of service for children in need of services, such as neglected and abused children. For example, in this project multidisciplinary assessment teams representing a range of agencies participate in a joint assessment of a child's problems and determine the child's treatment plan. Ideally, this will be done at the point of initial referral, thereby avoiding the need to place a child in a holding facility or emergency foster care while awaiting a series of interviews and deliberations taking place over a period of days or weeks. Hopefully, such models of care can help resolve some of the coordination problems at the local level in providing assessment and treatment of neglected and abused children.

The lack of coordination and cooperation among public agencies is compounded at the local level among the numerous public and private agencies, particularly in such matters as gaining access to treatment or therapy programs. This is a recurring problem because there is little opportunity for joint planning to determine systemwide priorities. For example, a county welfare department cannot direct a community mental health program operated by a private non-profit organization under contract to another county agency to serve specific clients. The latter organization has its own priorities and preferences and receives funding from separate sources.

Historic differences in philosophy and mission continue to hinder effective cooperation between social agencies and the juvenile justice system, particularly in cases involving youth who have been victims of abuse and who have not committed a crime, but are also considered to be "out-of-control." The distinctions between which agency has jurisdiction and responsibility over such cases are not always clear. In fact, there is concern among social welfare professionals that the dependency process discussed in Chapter IV of this report, which is authorized in Section 300 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, may be used inappropriately at times as a vehicle for securing access to services for children and youth who do not fit the statutory definition of dependency.

Coordination problems at the local level are closely tied to a lack of leadership at the State level. Leadership, coupled with commensurate changes in legal mandates and funding arrangements are imperative to the effective treatment of neglected and abused children.

FINDING #3: THE COURT SYSTEM IS EXPERIENCING DIFFICULTIES IN DEALING WITH THE NUMBER OF CASES OF NEGLECT AND ABUSE.

The Court system is experiencing difficulties in dealing with the increasing number of cases involving abused and neglected children, including cases of dependency and the need for juvenile court supervision of "status offenders." Recent legislative reforms, including SB 14 in 1982 and subsequent measures, were intended to bring about needed changes and to expedite dependency proceedings. However, these reforms have not fully addressed problems of court delay and in some cases have made the problems worse. Delays in the court system can further traumatize abused and neglected children because the ultimate placement decision is prolonged.

One critical concern of social welfare professionals is to avoid the unnecessary removal of a child from his or her home. State law now dictates that in cases where removal is found necessary, planning for family reunification must be performed. Sometimes there may be disregard for this law due to funding and program constraints.

Procedural delays, in the form of petitions and continuances, also delay the timely decisions intended by the SB 14 reforms. In some jurisdictions, lengthy delays in the permanency planning for children frustrate the achievement of the goals in the law. While this issue is clearly part of the larger problem of workload excesses and calendar delays facing our court system, the special needs of abused and neglected children may require alternative administrative arrangements within the court system.

Permanency planning hearings mandated by SB 14 often duplicate the termination of parental rights proceedings dictated in Civil Code Section 232. This can delay the resolution of the case for some neglected or abused children. In some locales, special subdivisions of juvenile courts have been established to handle dependency proceedings. This has resulted in improved awareness and attention to the sensitive nature of these cases. Ideally, these subdivisions of juvenile court are presided over by judges selected for their familiarity with the law and administrative procedures unique to child abuse cases.

FINDING #4: CURRENT APPROACHES TO INVESTIGATING ALLEGATIONS OF ABUSE AND NEGLECT MAY PROVE DAMAGING TO FAMILIES AND CHILDREN.

In response to requirements mandated by SB 14, county welfare departments currently utilize an "assembly line" approach to investigating allegations of child abuse. This approach treats all allegations of abuse and neglect equally for investigative purposes, and may involve numerous interviews with child welfare professionals. This lengthy and exhaustive process can be very traumatic to the child and his or her family. Due to the duplicative nature and potentially harmful impact of this process, there is a need to reexamine current case management approaches.

The need to improve the delivery of services provided to abused and neglected children is recognized by professionals in many disciplines and organizations. The impact of the growing number of child abuse reports, coupled with changes in procedures following the enactment of SB 14, has resulted in major administrative changes at the local level. This growth in activity has prompted new management problems and compounded existing ones. Among those causing concern are the procedures used for interviewing children at the initial stages of an investigation, the lack of multidisciplinary assessment teams to devise plans of treatment, and the problem of dealing with delays in securing required approvals caused by clogged court calendars.

Current approaches to investigating allegations of abuse and neglect dictated by SB 14 may contribute to the hardships families and children face during the investigation because of the "assembly line" processing procedures. Although the SB 14 procedures for processing cases were developed in an effort to cope with the growing volume of reported cases, these procedures can result in the involvement of as many as 22 child welfare professionals, each of whom must interview and review a child's case separately. This extended process can be very damaging to the welfare of a child. For example, this approach leads to great frustration and potential psychological damage, as a child is forced to recall and repeat accounts of pain and suffering. In addition, families grow mistrustful as they are denied the ability to work consistently with one social worker.

Possible alternatives to current case management approaches deserve consideration. They include the use of properly trained multidisciplinary assessment teams representing a range of agencies. Such teams could make joint assessments which would include determining all the probable services the child needs and making appropriate referrals. This could result in a thorough consideration of the varying needs of the child and hopefully eliminate the fragmentation of services currently offered. Such assessments could be made at the point of initial referral, thus eliminating the need to place a child in a holding facility or emergency foster care.

FINDING #5: INCREASED NUMBER OF REPORTS OF CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT COMBINED WITH LIMITED RESOURCES HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO WORKLOAD PROBLEMS.

Although State funding for programs serving neglected and abused children has increased significantly in recent years, there is still a considerable lack of available resources to provide services. Without the expanded availability of resources for providing services, many children desperately in need of services will not receive them.

Studies across the nation have shown drastic reductions in child fatalities following the enactment of protective legislation. For example, within five years of the passage of a comprehensive reporting law in the State of New York, there was a 50 percent reduction in child fatalities. Media attention to the importance of reporting cases of child abuse and neglect have deepened public concern and involvement in the problem. Ironically, the good intentions of most reporters of child abuse and neglect have also contributed to virtually unmanageable caseloads.

The law currently dictates that mandated reporters are required to report cases where a "reasonable suspicion" of abuse exists. Because mandated reporters do not routinely receive training in detecting abuse, the interpretation of this law is sometimes quite broad. For instance, we found from some reporters that a common interpretation was that "any possibility" of abuse should be reported. Current legal definitions of abuse are so broad that this problem is compounded by varying interpretations of what constitutes abuse. For instance, many agree that spanking a child doesn't constitute abuse, but when it leaves a bruise or other marking it may be. This leads to difficult questions concerning how much bruising or marking necessitates charges of abuse. While decisions like these fall to the professionals, we find that their interpretations are also broad. The trend toward increased reporting is evident from an inspection of data from previous years. Exhibit III.1 provides a summary of trends in child abuse reports investigated in California in recent years.

Exhibit III.1

SUMMARY OF TRENDS IN CHILD ABUSE REPORTS INVESTIGATED IN CALIFORNIA

Year	Number of Cases
1975	4,900
1980	21,000
1983	43,985
1985	60,627

SOURCE: Office of the Attorney General, Commission on the Enforcement of Child Abuse Laws, "Final Report", 1985.

As indicated in Exhibit III.1, investigated reports of child abuse have swelled from 4,900 in 1975 to well over 60,000 in 1985. Last year, approximately 60% of the reported cases of abuse were found to be "unsubstantiated". It is important to note that "unsubstantiated" does not mean that abuse or neglect did not occur, but that sufficient evidence was not available to justify intervention. Inadequate methods of recordkeeping currently preclude researchers from knowing how many unsubstantiated cases of abuse may have been substantiated later with a subsequent report and investigation. However, evidence does suggest that unintentional false reporting as well as malicious reporting of child abuse is rising. The latter case seems to occur most often in cases of family conflict, including marital disputes and child custody battles where the report is made in an effort to embarrass or discredit the other party. As a result, the energies and resources of agencies responsible for investigating reports may be unnecessarily expended.

According to the director of the State Department of Social Services, State funding targeted specifically to child welfare services programs has increased from $129,073,000 in 1982 to $266,683,000 in 1986. However, the 1980's also brought reductions in the amount of local and federal funding for child welfare services. The impact of local funding constraints imposed by Proposition 13 combined with drastic reductions in federal Title XX and Title IV-B allocations in 1981 caused a gradual yet drastic erosion of services to neglected and abused children. The substantial increases in State funding came in response to public outcry about the lack of adequate services for neglected and abused children.

Due to the limited capacity to provide services, the current workload pressures can have disastrous effects on children and families. In fact, the resulting procedural delays and limited spaces in appropriate programs, combined with the lack of time and resources to appropriately educate case workers, have led to the alarming fact that reporting abuse or neglect does not assure a child's safety. Heartbreaking accounts of children who are denied services they desperately need while other children are unnecessarily removed from their home attest to the fact that deep rooted problems exist.

This problem of "underserving" some and applying unnecessary or inappropriate intervention to others is not unique to California. In reviewing data on national trends in child abuse programs, Douglas Besharov, former director of the United States Center on Child Abuse and Neglect, concluded in 1985 that child protective cases have reached unprecedented levels. Moreover, he stated that oftentimes pragmatic program restraints lead to intervention that is unwarranted, harmful to families, and traumatic to children.

One way to cope with increased workload is to assure that assessment standards are clear and that more adequate attention is given to the initial assessment process. In addition, given the large number of cases reported, it is even more critical that the system provide other avenues of treatment, such as preventive or supportive counseling, for those children not determined to be in immediate risk.

FINDING #6: LACK OF COMPREHENSIVE TRAINING AND PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES FOR CONDUCTING INVESTIGATIONS

There is limited training for child welfare professionals, mandatory reporters, and foster parents. Due to their lack of training, the potential exists for increased trauma to children and families. Additionally, the lack of procedures and guidelines for conducting investigations makes it impossible to assess the level of risk without a face-to-face investigation of every complaint.

Despite increasing efforts to provide training for persons involved in reporting and treating cases of child abuse and neglect, more comprehensive and realistic training efforts are still required. Although the Office of Child Abuse Prevention (OCAP) in the Department of Social Services offers some training sessions to child abuse workers, outreach is limited and there remains significant need for training for all who work with abused and neglected children.

Training in the specific activities associated with child abuse, such as the operation of criminal justice and civil justice systems and the use of appropriate investigative techniques, is not uniformly incorporated into professional curricula in schools of social work. Actually, the rapid increase of reported cases of child abuse in recent years has yet to be matched with training to meet new responsibilities. Training needs extend beyond social workers to all of those who work with abused and neglected children, including judges and other members of the justice system.

Additionally, training in the detection and reporting of child abuse is not offered consistently to other professional groups including physicians, educators, psychologists, and clergy who are involved in the reporting and treatment of child abuse. Training efforts need to extend to mandatory reporters to ensure that at a minimum these professionals have a clear understanding of reporting laws. Although physicians typically receive no training in detection and reporting requirements, they often make referrals regarding cases of physical or sexual abuse. In some instances, these referrals have resulted in unwarranted intervention.

While it is unfair to blame doctors for trying to fulfill their legal obligations to report suspected abuse cases, part of this problem can be solved through properly educating physicians on detection and reporting of child abuse. Furthermore, there needs to be a recognition that many doctors do not have the expertise to accurately detect abuse. When medical attention is needed to verify cases of sexual or other forms of abuse it is important that only doctors who can substantiate their expertise in such detection be utilized.

Foster parents are not routinely offered or required to complete training. The assumption has historically been that parents do not require special skills to fulfill their role, therefore foster parents do not receive training. While effective parenting of any child requires skills, the child placed in foster care has been subjected to a potentially traumatic ordeal that requires special sensitivities on the part of the foster parent.

Another problem in conducting investigations is the lack of uniform procedural requirements and consistent guidelines for conducting investigations that prevent public agencies from responding effectively and in a timely manner. The law dictates that it is necessary to investigate all reports. However, given the number of child abuse reports, it may be necessary to develop standards for assessing the level of risk to insure that children are not unnecessarily removed from the home.

FINDING #7: INADEQUATE INFORMATION REGARDING THE OUTCOMES OF REPORTED CASES OF ABUSE AND NEGLECT.

There is no systematic data collection to provide insight into the effectiveness of family reunification services or prevention services for neglected and abused children. Thus, the benefits of the current system for handling neglected and abused children and its cost effectiveness are difficult to determine.

Administration of programs for the neglected and abused at the State level is hampered by a lack of useful information about the outcomes of treatment services. Although the State collects information on the disposition of foster care cases, such as adoption, guardianship, and emancipation, there is no comparable data on the effectiveness of family reunification services or those prevention services intended to avoid the necessity of an out-of-home placement for abused and neglected children. Thus, the State does not have information to help policymakers decide whether the major policy changes have improved services to children.

Furthermore, it is difficult to determine which administrative and treatment approaches are most productive. For example, it is currently not possible to determine what happens in cases where no intervention is offered following a report of possible child abuse or neglect. Thus, the benefits of the system of child protection can not be accurately determined. Although services are provided to alleviate complex family problems, it should be possible to develop a better understanding of how well different services work through systematic data collection and research studies designed to clarify decision processes and their outcomes.

FINDING #8: SHORTAGE OF ADEQUATE SERVICES TO ABUSED AND NEGLECTED CHILDREN ESPECIALLY THOSE WITH SPECIAL NEEDS.

While there is a severe shortage of foster care and other necessary services for all children who have been neglected and abused, the shortage is especially acute for those with special needs. This is primarily due to rate structures and reimbursement policies that do not fully consider the additional services these children need.

The shortage of capable, trained foster families is a statewide problem, one which limits the ability of child welfare agencies to place children in settings where they will receive both a secure environment and an appropriate treatment program. This scarcity is particularly acute with regard to children who have experienced severe abuse and neglect, and other "special needs" populations served by child welfare agencies.

- Many abused and neglected children require special services for their physical and emotional injuries or to deal with problems resulting from cumulative trauma and deprivation. While these children are a minority of the total dependency population, they are frequently the most difficult to serve. This population includes children who have been abused or neglected and are also:

    - Medically fragile infants;
    - Physically disabled children;
    - Children and youth who have had multiple foster placements;
    - Infants experiencing drug withdrawal;
    - Children with AIDS; and
    - Children who have grown up in foster care.

Serving these populations through foster family care is difficult, and in cases where hospitalization is required, nearly impossible. In an effort to serve these children with chronic problems, emergency shelter facilities are often utilized as long-term maintenance facilities. For example, during an on-site visit at San Francisco General Hospital, the Commission observed drug addicted babies that were forced to remain in the hospital because foster parents who were adequately trained to care for these babies could not be found. As the limited spaces in such facilities are utilized in this manner, their use for new emergency placements is preempted.

Available services, rate structures and reimbursement policies do not often consider the additional services that children with special need require. Mental health services are frequently unavailable for this vulnerable group of children. They often receive mental health services only when there is an acute crisis, and then it is only very short-term intervention. Furthermore, there are few financial incentives for providers to serve many of these children given the constraints on reimbursement and the high costs of care.

Other special need areas include children from ethnic minorities and gay and lesbian youth. In addition, different value systems and concerns over discrimination or prejudice mean that children from minority backgrounds often require attention different from that customarily provided. The concerns and needs of children and youth from ethnic and sexual minorities require greater attention from public and private social welfare agencies.

FINDING #9: LACK OF ADEQUATE PLACEMENT RESOURCES TO SERVE NEGLECTED AND ABUSED CHILDREN WHO NEED OUT-OF-HOME CARE.

There is an acute shortage of out-of-home care options that offer a supportive, secure environment to the children who need them. Services provided are often applied haphazardly without regard for the needs of the child. As a result, children who could be placed in a less expensive care situation must remain in higher cost care facilities and children needing special treatment or services may not receive such care.

The average number of children in foster care per month during the fiscal year 1983-84 was almost 32,000. Most children who need out-of-home care are referred to foster homes. The family-type environment possible in foster care has many positive aspects that can't be achieved in the institutional setting. However, we found that the quality of foster care homes can vary quite widely.

While there are many dedicated, effective foster parents, there are also some ineffective ones. The wide variation in foster parent quality is, in part, due to the fact that they require no training or certification to be licensed. Foster care pay rates, a poor public image, and a tendency among social workers to treat foster parents as clients rather than service workers, combine to create disincentives for becoming a foster parent. Exhibit III.2, shows the foster care base rates in a typical California county, effective July 1986.

Exhibit III.2
CALIFORNIA FOSTER CARE RATES IN A TYPICAL COUNTY AS OF JULY 1, 1986

Age	Rate/Month
0 - 4	$294
5 - 8	$319
9 - 11	$340
12 - 14	$378
15 - 20	$412

These foster care rates, for 24-hour care, are comparable to the rates that many working California families pay for daytime child care. In addition to the rates, the pool of traditional families potentially able to provide foster care is shrinking. Working families who need child care cannot afford to offer their services as foster parents because of child care costs. Pursuant to SB 2218, Chapter 1094, Statutes of 1986, the State Department of Social Services is currently conducting a study to establish a new basis for foster care rates. This study will be completed by January 1988.

The concept of regular day care and 24-hour respite care for foster parents has been advanced by some child welfare professionals as a partial solution to the incentive problems. Abused and neglected children who are in the foster care system have priority in gaining enrollment at State-subsidized child care centers. However, long waiting lists at many of these facilities dictate that children who might be served in this fashion cannot normally expect to receive this service on short notice.

There are currently not enough placement alternatives for out-of-home care for abused and neglected children. Presently, choices are usually limited to foster care and high cost institutional or group home care. Special purpose foster homes which operate in conjunction with and under the auspices of institutional facilities have been established in some locales, but are not uniformly available. These "foster family agencies" are seen as one possible avenue to address the placement problem. A continuum of care, from the most intensive to the least intensive, is needed in every area to assure that children can receive the care they need rather than requiring workers to make decisions based on availability.

Few placement alternatives are suited to the needs of special populations. For many teens, a supervised congregate living arrangement with access to services in the community may be preferable both from a cost and policy standpoint. Such arrangements represent a radical departure from the common understanding of what constitutes an appropriate substitute "family" for abused and neglected youth. However, such alternatives will need to be defined and evaluated on a pilot basis before broad public acceptance can be expected.

In instances where removal from the home is not appropriate, short-term foster care, or even special purpose day care, including seasonal or respite foster care, may provide a cost-effective alternative to long-term, out-of-home placement. The machinery to permit use of this option is in place. What is lacking in practice often proves to be the right resource, such as the right placement for a particular child at the right time. The key to improving services in this area lies in improving incentives for potential providers to enter the market and in supporting current providers by adapting their services to better meet current needs.

CHAPTER IV
RUNAWAY/HOMELESS YOUTH

There is not a continuing programmatic and financial commitment to fund services for runaway/homeless youth in California. The current identifiable programs are limited to assistance for a statewide toll-free runaway hotline and two demonstration projects authorized by Assembly Bill 1596. Even though public agencies, such as mental health and protective services frequently deny runaway/homeless youth access to their programs, this population may be able to obtain limited treatment in some instances in existing programs designed to serve other populations. However, the likelihood of a youth actually receiving such services is slim since there usually is no reimbursement to the service provider. Accordingly, few providers will risk serving a population which effectively cannot pay or command reimbursement. As a result, many of the runaway/homeless youth continue to "fall through the cracks" of our public service system.

FINDING #10: PROBLEMS OF RUNAWAY/HOMELESS YOUTH ARE NOT FULLY RECOGNIZED.

Although there may be as many as 25,000 runaway/homeless youth in California who have a multitude of problems, adequate programs and services are not available for them. Since a majority of these youth are often forced to engage in criminal activity, prostitution and drug use as a means of survival, intervention may be a cost-effective means of dealing with these youth. If their problems are not addressed now, there is a strong likelihood that these youth will not become responsible and productive adults and will be a burden on the State the rest of their lives.

There are no accurate statistics available on the number of runaway/homeless youth in California, although some experts believe that there may be as many as 20,000 to 25,000 runaway/homeless youth. For the purpose of our study, an individual is considered a "runaway/homeless" youth if he or she meets the following criteria:

- Is under the age of 18;
- Is living on the streets as a result of intolerable home conditions or by choice; and
- Has no adequate legal means of support for daily necessities.

The actual number of youth fitting this description in California is unknown. A Bush Program study, conducted by the University of California, Los Angeles, entitled "Focus on Runaway and Homeless Youth" concluded that neither experts nor the available records could provide a reliable approximation of the number of runaway and homeless youth in Los Angeles County. However, they were able to identify a lack of appropriate community resources to serve this population and observed that the lack of resources hinders the reasonable provision of services to runaway and homeless youth.

Health and Mental Health Problems

Runaway/homeless youth as a group are characterized by a high incidence of mental and physical health problems, including chronic depression, sexually-transmitted diseases, and substance abuse. In addition, it is estimated that a majority have histories of physical and/or sexual abuse that contributed to these problems. A recent study prepared by the Los Angeles Children's Hospital entitled "A Risk Profile Comparison of Runaway and Non-Runaway Youth," concluded that runaway/homeless youth are at much greater risk of acquiring a wide variety of diseases and problem-producing behaviors than their non-runaway/homeless counterparts. For example, this study reported a high level of intravenous drug use by runaway/homeless youth. In fact, approximately 35 percent of these youths indicated that they had used intravenous drugs in the last six months. Since intravenous drug users represent a high-risk population for acquired immune deficiency (AIDS), and because runaway/homeless youth frequently engage in prostitution to support themselves, the health problems of these youths could have a significant impact on the overall community.

The consequences of homelessness also often include serious physical and mental health problems, for which treatment, if at all available, is costly. According to a recent study, 84 percent of the runaway/homeless youth seen at a medical clinic in Los Angeles were diagnosed as being depressed and 18 percent were diagnosed as having major mental health problems. Moreover, when compared to their peers, runway/homeless youth are 4.5 times as likely to be actively suicidal or to have some other serious mental health problem.

Risk of Involvement in Crime

Runaway/homeless youth are also exposed to a high risk of involvement in crime. They are frequently victims of specific exploitive crimes, such as prostitution and child pornography. For example, federal studies estimate that approximately 25 percent of these youth are homeless street kids who are often exploited by criminal elements. The Commission's study showed that runaway/homeless youth often lead a virtual underground existence in our State's major urban cities, where they sleep in abandoned buildings, take drugs to soften their harsh world, and often become involved in prostitution in order to survive on the streets.

The costs of administering the juvenile and adult corrections systems and incarcerating offenders are very high, ranging up to $30,000 per person annually. Thus, intervention and diversion may be a much lower cost alternative by preventing the "drift" of runaway/homeless youth into criminal activity. This cost savings could be significant based on the Bush Program's study conducted by the University of California, Los Angeles. This study indicated that 75 percent of the hard-core "street kids" engage in criminal activity to support themselves and 50 percent engage in prostitution.

In addition to avoiding costs "downstream" in the criminal justice and courts system and preventing exploitation of these youth by criminal elements, the benefits of effective services to runaway/homeless youth include savings in medical, mental health and substance abuse programs, and the potential benefits realized from an individual's future earnings and contributions as a productive member of society.

FINDING #11: RUNAWAY/HOMELESS YOUTH TEND TO "FALL THROUGH THE CRACKS" OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PROGRAMS.

Runaway/homeless youth are found in all regions of the State, and come from all parts of California, as well as from other states. Many youths who run away from their homes because of a temporary family dispute remain close to their most recent community of residence; however, the truly homeless youths often travel far from their previous homes. While the presence of runaway/homeless youth is a statewide phenomenon, relatively few state dollars are expended for these youth. This is partly due to the fact that there is a lack of understanding of these youths by the general population. Moreover, the current classification scheme in the Welfare and Institutions Code does not adequately recognize the needs of runaway/homeless youth for services.

Level of State Effort

The low level of program activity targeted for runaway/homeless youth, both in the public and private sectors, suggests that the needs of this population have not been fully recognized. The survey of State programs identified only two State level programs designed to deal with this population--the Runaway Hotline and the AB 1596 Services to Homeless Youth Pilot Project, both of which are administered by the State Governor's Office of Criminal Justice Planning. Funding for these programs is limited to short-term appropriations and there is, at present, no commitment of continuing financial resources.

The current pilot projects serving runaway/homeless youth funded by AB 1596 (Agnos) provide the opportunity to demonstrate the effectiveness of integrated/coordinated services. The two projects authorized by the legislation are located in San Francisco and Los Angeles. These projects began operations as early as July 1986. While it is still too early to evaluate the results of these projects, demand for services is already reported to exceed capacity at both sites.

Both pilot projects combine three service components:

Emergency Service
- Locating homeless youth
- Providing food and temporary shelter
- Screening for basic health needs
- Addressing immediate emotional crisis or problems

Long-Term Stabilization Planning
- Assisting in reunification with parents or guardian
- Finding a suitable alternative placement where reunification is not practical

- Helping prepare older youth for independent living

Follow-Up Services

- Monitoring the relations between parent or guardian where reunification has occurred
- Providing follow-up services to ascertain how successfully the youth is functioning

The projects are authorized to operate through June 30, 1988 with a final report in January 1989. These projects will provide a data base necessary for the development of a comprehensive runaway/homeless program. Specifically, the projects will provide the following:

- Effectiveness of outreach
- Effectiveness of coordination between agencies
- Ability to secure access to treatment
- Success of treatment
- Identification of additional or needed services
- Categorization of kinds of youth served

The projects will also collect data on the basic demographic characteristics of young people seen by all of the other runaway/homeless youth agencies in the two target cities and in San Diego and San Jose. Once this data is collected, the State will be able to adequately assess the magnitude and complexity of the runaway/homeless youth population and develop appropriate treatment outcomes.

Lack of a State Mandate for Services

While runaway/homeless youth could be subject to dependency hearings pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code Section 300, in actuality this rarely occurs and is for the most part impractical. In addition, current public agency services provided pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code Sections 601 and 602, and related provisions do not effectively direct resources to the needs of runaway/homeless youth.

Currently, "homelessness" does not qualify a youth for State-mandated services, such as welfare and food stamp programs, and there is no clear direction or mandate to local governments for serving this population. Being homeless does not, in itself, establish eligibility for youths or adults. In the face of demands for funding from other better established programs, programs to serve the runaway/homeless youth population do not receive "secure" funding from the State. This is partly attributable to the fact that there is no organization in State government charged with assuring the delivery of services to runaway/homeless youth. Thus, it is not difficult to see why this population tends to "fall through the cracks" of the children's service delivery system.

Additionally, this population is difficult for traditional social programs to serve because most runaway/homeless youth are disconnected from their families or other sources of stability, such as school or work. The problem of serving the runaway/homeless youth population is compounded by the lack of reliable data concerning their numbers; however, the few programs designed to serve runaway/homeless youth consistently report an inability to serve the total number of youth seeking assistance.

The Dependency Process

California has established a set of procedures whereby neglected and abused children are declared to be dependents of the Juvenile Court, pursuant to the provisions of Welfare and Institutions Code Section 300 et seq. The dependency process includes a court hearing conducted to inquire into the ability of their parents to provide for their welfare. In practice, this process is used mainly for children age 12 or under. Because social work professionals and court personnel believe that children in this age group are more susceptible than are older children to problems of abuse, efforts by social services agencies tend to focus on younger children.

A finding of dependency establishes eligibility for services funded through the Aid for Families with Dependent Children program (AFDC). As a practical matter, the pressure on public social service agencies to respond to reports of child abuse and to administer existing caseload leaves little time for establishing dependency for runaway/homeless youth. Moreover, child protective service agencies typically are not used to working with older, more transient populations for whom it is difficult to establish eligibility for reimbursement for treatment services. Additionally, it is a policy of many county departments of social services to not provide services for out-of-county youth other than, in some cases, to provide transportation for them to return home. This is only of benefit to these runaway youth for whom family reunification is an option.

The Youthful Offender Process

Many of the runaway/homeless youth are known as "status offenders". These youth are classified as neither a criminal nor a delinquent, but rather a pre-delinquent. Until 1977, such youth could be incarcerated with ordinary juvenile criminals, even though they were legally innocent of any crime. In 1977, however, AB 3121 (Dixon) was passed, which "decriminalized" runaways and other status offenders. Instead, runaways and other homeless youth now could not be detained more than 24 hours. County Probation Departments were allowed, but not required, to establish separate facilities where homeless youth could be sheltered while attempts were made to return them to their home. The problem with effectively helping these children is twofold. First, there is a lack of necessary and adequate facilities. Outside the State foster care system, Commission staff have been able to identify the following:

- In Los Angeles County there are a total of 4 licensed runaway or homeless youth shelters with 24 beds plus a probation program with 28 beds in private foster homes available for a total homeless population which may be as much as 10,000;

- In San Francisco with a homeless youth population estimated between 2,000 and 3,000, there are less than 50 beds available for homeless youth;
- Throughout the remainder of the State, there are only 6 known programs providing shelter to homeless youth with a total capacity of only 56 beds.

The second problem is the confusion among the government agencies established to help these youth. It has been estimated that two-thirds of California's homeless youth are victims of abuse, either physical or sexual. However, runaways come under the authority of the probation department and the juvenile justice system, while abused children are dealt with by the social service system on the state and local level. Therefore, when a youth is picked up by a police officer and tells the officer, "I'm a runaway because I was molested at home," the youth often is referred to the local social services agency as an abused child. The social services agency, in turn, may refuse to help the youth, saying that, as a runaway, this "problem child" belongs in the juvenile justice system. The youth needing help then "falls through the cracks" of the system. This dilemma appears to apply to a majority of homeless youth.

Unique Problems of Minority Populations

Young people who find themselves "on the street" do not comprise a homogenous population although they may share a distrust for public agencies and adult authority. This distrust may be compounded for members of cultural minorities, for whom cooperation from family and/or other community leaders may not be easy to obtain. For some youth, particularly newer immigrants, there are language barriers to obtaining service. Others will participate only in services that operate in non-traditional settings, such as programs for gay and lesbian youth. Because runaway/homeless youth rarely are served pursuant to a court order which directs cooperation with a social service agency, active cooperation of participants is critical to the effectiveness of services.

FINDING #12: MODELS OF TREATMENT DEVELOPED FOR ABUSED AND NEGLECTED CHILDREN OR YOUTHFUL OFFENDERS GENERALLY DO NOT SUIT THE NEEDS OF HOMELESS YOUTH.

Runaway/homeless youth generally require a wide array of services involving numerous agencies. Stabilization in a safe environment with a fixed responsibility for services is the key to effectively serving these youth. Unfortunately, few communities provide this crucial coordination.

The services developed for assisting abused and neglected children and their families are not appropriate for the runaway/homeless youth population. Unconventional means of connecting with these youths are often required to bring runaway/homeless youth to service programs, and few public agencies have the flexibility to use some of the techniques employed by successful private programs. Once contact has been established, runaway/homeless youth generally require a wide array of services, including food and shelter, health care, counseling and mental health services, education, job training and employment services. Agencies involved could include:

- Law Enforcement
- Juvenile Justice
- Social Services
- Mental Health Services
- Drug and Alcohol Services
- Health Services
- Education
- Community-Based Private Agencies

Stabilization in a safe environment, with a fixed responsibility for services, is the key to serving this population effectively. Because few agencies are equipped to provide the whole range of services needed by these youth, active referral, follow-up and coordination are essential for an effective treatment program. With the exception of the two pilot projects pursuant to AB 1596, no State programs are authorized or funded to coordinate services for this population.

The Commission's study did identify some loose-knit local efforts to serve runaway/homeless youth that were being conducted by private non-profit agencies that received some public funding. For example, in San Francisco there is a working relationship that has developed between four agencies. These agencies have established a shelter network that provides an interlocking system of services to the city's runaway/homeless youth. This network includes a community-based counseling center, an emergency shelter, a short-term shelter and placement agency, and an independent living program. However, the San Francisco effort is the exception, not the rule, in treating runaway/homeless youth in California communities.

FINDING #13: FAMILY REUNIFICATION IS NOT A REALISTIC GOAL FOR MANY RUNAWAY/HOMELESS YOUTH.

Family reunification which is the primary objective of State-mandated child welfare services is not a realistic goal for a significant portion of the runaway/homeless youth population who have been abandoned by their parents or who have left abusive family situations. In such cases, emancipation is a more realistic goal and this can be accomplished by independent living programs coupled with treatment services. However, few such programs are available for runaway/homeless youth. Other than limited term emergency shelter facilities or foster care placements, there are insufficient stable, safe options for shelter. Given this scarcity of resources, it is not surprising that so many youth remain on the streets.

The following case examples illustrate that the goals of runaway/homeless youth are different and therefore require different approaches. Ann was referred to a community-based service program for runaway/homeless youth by a police officer who noticed her in a downtown neighborhood frequented by transients. She told program staff that she left home several weeks ago following a series of arguments with her mother over school. In addition, she had problems with her finances because she spent all her savings. She and her divorced mother "just don't get along." She is 16, and thinks she can take care of herself. She admits to being out of funds, but claims she knows she can get a job.

Another youth named Bob came to the attention of a mental health services worker through a referral from the emergency room of a large metropolitan hospital. He was receiving treatment for the third time in three months for a sexually transmitted disease. The public health case worker became concerned over his safety after discovering that the youth was "surviving" through prostitution, and had no permanent residence. Through an initial counseling session, the mental health worker learned that Bob had been living on the streets for nearly six months after having been abandoned by his drug dependent mother. He is 15, has never attended school regularly, and has lived with his mother in many locations around the country. He cannot read above second grade level. He has a history of substance abuse problems and experiences severe depression.

Both these young people have come to the attention of a social services program. Both need help and assistance. There, the similarity ends. Ann's case presents the possibility of reunification with the family she left and to which she could possibly return. Her need for services is modest. In Bob's case, the reunification option is not present. He can only return to the streets or find an alternative living arrangement after leaving an emergency shelter program. Most importantly, Bob has a need for a range of treatment services, including substance abuse, mental health, and health care with are not currently available through emergency shelter programs that typically serve runaway/homeless youth.

While the level of resources committed to Ann's problem may not be sufficient to deal with every comparable case, there are, at least, the legal mechanisms and service mandates to address her problems. That same statement cannot be made in the case of Bob. Who is equipped to deal with Bob's problems? The answer to that question is discussed in the remainder of this chapter.

As the previous examples illustrated, there are some runaway/homeless youth who potentially can be reunified with their families. However, there is another portion of the runaway/homeless youth population for whom family reunification is not a realistic goal. It is important to recognize the differences in the youth that make up the runaway/homeless youth population and to treat them accordingly.

FINDING #14: IMPEDIMENTS EXIST TO PROVIDING SERVICES TO RUNAWAY/HOMELESS YOUTH AT THE LOCAL LEVEL.

A variety of impediments exist that restrict the ability to provide services to runaway/homeless youth at the local level. These impediments include difficulty establishing or documenting residency for runaway/homeless youth, insufficient emergency and intermediate length shelter capacity, a lack of interagency cooperation, and inadequate continuing services for runaway/homeless youth. As a result, runaway/homeless youth do not receive needed services and must exist on the streets supporting themselves. This often includes resorting to criminal activity, drugs, and prostitution to eke out a living.

Residency and Other Administrative Requirements

Determination of residency and other administrative considerations complicate the provision of services to runaway/homeless youth in California. There is evidence that runaway/homeless youth who are unable to prove local residence have been denied services by public agencies.

In a written opinion dated October 23, 1986, California's Attorney General recently ruled that counties may not deny service to runaway/homeless youth simply because they are officially residents of some other county or state. Because runaway/homeless youth are under age 18, they are unable to receive financial aid from county general assistance welfare programs, unless they have been declared emancipated by the court. Because securing legal emancipation is time consuming and requires more resources than are available to most runaway/homeless youth, in practice, few in this population will receive such assistance.

Although runaway/homeless youth who are found to be dependent children are eligible for services under the AFDC foster care program, relatively few obtain service through this process, which requires time and the active cooperation that these youth are unlikely to provide. In addition, the priorities for dealing with reports of abuse and working with younger children limit the time social service workers have for dependency hearings for runaway/homeless youth. Service professionals who deal with this population observe that local jurisdictions rarely accept responsibility for coordinating services for runaway/homeless youth.

Insufficient Emergency and Intermediate Length Shelter Capacity

There is inadequate specialized emergency shelter capacity for runaway/homeless youth, and a lack of capacity or provision for intermediate length of stay facilities for youth lacking local "connections" or resources. Less than 50 beds are available in the greater Los Angeles area to serve a runaway/homeless population estimated to number in the thousands. In the San Francisco Bay Area, fewer than 50 licensed beds are available to serve a population also estimated in the thousands. Statewide, the number of specialized emergency shelter facilities equipped to serve runaway/homeless youth is not known. Based on a review of available data, such facilities also exist in Sacramento and San Diego. We believe that the experience gained from the current pilot projects established pursuant to AB 1596 for runaway/homeless youth in San Francisco and Los Angeles will establish the need for many more beds.

Although State and federal funding has been provided for the operation and construction of some shelter facilities, length of stay is generally limited to two weeks under federal law for facilities receiving federal funds. Two weeks does not provide sufficient time to stabilize a youth who has experienced multiple problems. Greater flexibility is needed regarding length of stay to serve those members of the runaway/homeless youth population who cannot be returned home and whose only alternative other than living on the streets may be to exchange sex for shelter.

Local zoning, building codes, and land use requirements frequently have inhibited the location and operation of shelter facilities. Organizations seeking to open licensed emergency shelter facilities have found that opposition from neighbors and building code requirements have prevented the use of existing available space in the locations most suitable--typically those in and around downtown areas. In addition, inflexible enforcement of State licensing requirements has limited the ability of certain programs to offer emergency shelter facilities.

Lack of Interagency Cooperation

New protocols between law enforcement and social service agencies are necessary in many communities to avoid "ping-pong" contacts with agencies and to avoid counter-productive administrative activity for law enforcement agencies. Because juvenile justice agencies no longer admit runaway/homeless youth into their juvenile halls upon referral, law enforcement agencies often have no place to send runaway/homeless youth picked up on the street. Youth often are picked up only to be released on the streets, a repetitive cycle that creates frustration and non-productive administrative workload for law enforcement. Because some law enforcement organizations lack strong working relations with social programs, referrals to social agencies does not always occur. The Governor's Office of Criminal Justice Planning has recognized this problem and is seeking a means to promote and encourage the transfer of information among law enforcement and social services agencies serving the runaway/homeless population through current AB 1596 projects.

Inadequate Continuing Services for Runaway/Homeless Youth

Many of the programs serving runaway/homeless youth are operated by private agencies. These programs are not always well integrated with established public programs, which complicates access to treatment services. In the absence of a state mandate to serve this population, the response has come from concerned individuals and agencies in communities where the problem has been most visible. Because runaway/homeless youth are unable to pay for services such as health care, some other agency must "pick up the tab" for such services. While local sources such as the United Way play a significant role in supporting services to needy populations, they are unwilling to assume complete continuing responsibility for funding what are generally perceived as "public agency responsibilities". The voluntary sector agencies which serve the runaway/homeless are often the only help available.

CHAPTER V

CHILDREN IN NEED OF CHILD CARE SERVICES

Economic influences have prompted significant changes in California families during the past three decades. Dual wage earning families are commonplace and increasing divorce rates have signaled a dramatic increase in the number of children living in single female headed households. Between 1960 and 1980, the percentage of women in the labor force with children under the age of six doubled. As a result, child care is a necessity for many working families. In fact, studies show that the cost of child care is now the third largest expense in the family budget, coming after shelter and food.

BACKGROUND

The numerous child care services in California are administered by two different departments: the State Department of Education (SDE) and the State Department of Social Services (DSS). These departments combined offer at least seventeen different programs. SDE is primarily responsible for administration, funding, standard setting, and monitoring subsidized child care for low income families. SDE has no direct responsibilities for non-subsidized child care other than its resource and referral services which are available to all persons seeking child care, regardless of income.

Programs within the Department of Education's jurisdiction include the following major programs: General Child Care and Development, State Preschool, Alternative Payment, Campus Child Care and Development, Migrant Child Care and Development, School Age Community Child Care (Latchkey Services), and School-Age Parenting and Infant Development (SAPID). Implemented at the local level, SDE's Resource and Referral Program provides information about both subsidized and non-subsidized child care availability to parents who need information. Common to each of these programs are standards and objectives that include a developmental or enrichment element.

The Department of Social Services (DSS) on the other hand, has statewide responsibility for licensing both subsidized and non-subsidized child care facilities, except for those exempted by law such as some school district programs. DSS also administers some welfare related subsidized child care programs and provides indirect subsidies for child care through an allowance included in welfare grants.

DSS acts through its agents, the County Welfare Departments, to provide subsidized child care services to welfare recipients eligible under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). These programs include: Work Incentive Demonstration Program (WIN), Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN), and Refugee Demonstration Project (RDP). Another indirect form of subsidized child care, called "Income Disregard," is offered pursuant to the provision of law that allows AFDC recipients who are involved in work or training to receive an allowance for child care expenses if they do not participate directly in subsidized care. This is accomplished by "disregarding" a portion of income in computing the welfare grant.

DSS also performs its statewide licensing activities through the Community Care Facilities Licensing Program pursuant to requirements and standards contained in the Health and Safety Code and Title 22 of the California Administrative Code.

There is no State agency that exercises responsibility for developing long-range plans and strategies concerning overall child care needs, demands, availability, accessibility, costs, benefits, financing, training needs, innovation, and quality assurance. Lack of this "organizational commitment" has been filled in part by the cooperative efforts of many advocate organizations, business associations, community groups and others interested in child care issues.

FINDING #15: CHILD CARE IS A NECESSITY FOR WORKING FAMILIES.

The State of California currently spends over $407 million annually to provide subsidized child care and to encourage non-subsidized child care. Due to economic and social changes in California, child care has become a necessity for "working families", including families with children headed by a single parent and dual-wage earning families. This growing need has fostered an availability crisis for quality child care. The Commission found that there is not a consensus regarding how the State should address this problem. However, it did identify various policy considerations that need to be addressed in resolving the availability crisis and specific impediments to quality child care that need to be overcome.

The increase of dual wage earning families coupled with an increase in families headed by single women has necessitated an increased need for supervision of children while their parents work. Many California families rely heavily on informal in-home child care arrangements by a parent, an immediate relative, or a friend. However, these arrangements have become less available to many families as the labor force participation of females continues to increase. In 1985, 51 percent of California women with children under six years of age were in the labor force, 42 percent of these women utilized child care arrangements outside their home.

Child care enables parents to provide necessary financial support for their families and can decrease dependency on welfare. A 1982 United States Bureau of the Census study found that 45 percent of the single mothers surveyed indicated that an unmet need for child care kept them from working. Furthermore, 20 percent of the mothers of children under age 4 who were employed part-time said that they would work more hours if suitable child care were available at reasonable costs.

The statistics above demonstrate that due to the social and economic changes in the past three decades, child care is not a luxury item for many families. Indeed, child care is a necessity for working families.

FINDING #16: CALIFORNIA IS EXPERIENCING AN AVAILABILITY CRISIS IN QUALITY CHILD CARE.

The unavailability of both nonsubsidized and subsidized child care has reached crisis proportions. According to a recent report by the Assembly Office of Research, less than 7 percent of California children who qualify for State subsidized child care receive it. In addition, because the private sector has been slow to respond to the need for child care, even middle income families that can afford to pay for it are sometimes unable to find suitable child care.

While it is apparent that there is a shortage of child care, particularly for infants and school-age children, there is no definitive study that has documented the overall shortage of child care spaces on a statewide basis. Many California counties have conducted studies assessing child care needs and availability and have documented dramatic shortages. For instance, a recent study of San Francisco and the surrounding bay area counties revealed that quality licensed child care is available to less than 60 percent of the residents who need it. Moreover, child care shortages are likely to worsen over the next 15 years as the number of children under six remain high and more women enter the labor force.

In many parts of the State, parents are confronted with long waiting lists for child care programs. This is particularly true for infant care where some prospective parents place children on waiting lists before or shortly after conception.

Despite "latchkey" legislation enacted to increase child care for school age children, the need for school age care continues to far exceed the supply. For example, United Way reports that in Los Angeles County there are about 239,000 children aged 5 through 12 who have working mothers and need supervised care before and after school, yet there are only 46,621 licensed and unlicensed school age child care spaces. A survey of employees in downtown Los Angeles revealed that 24 percent of children aged 7 to 9 and 79 percent of children aged 10 to 13 were left alone without any supervision for several hours each day.

An increase in the number of low income children needing child care coupled with the lack of adequate funding has resulted in a severe shortage of subsidized child care space. The State Department of Education estimates that between 90,000 and 110,000 children are currently receiving state subsidized child care. In February 1986 there were 130,000 eligible children on waiting lists for subsidized child care. Furthermore, based upon current eligibility standards and assumptions concerning need, the unmet demand for state subsidized child care for children under 14 years of age approximates 1 million children.

The fact that the private sector has not adequately met the need for child care warrants review. A number of necessary factors that affect the well being of children in child care contribute to the slow growth of the child care "industry." State regulations pertaining to child care include: inside and outside square footage requirements, minimum number of child to caregiver ratios, minimum "teacher" qualification requirements, and a host of fire, safety and health requirements. These regulations, which protect the health and safety of children, along with soaring insurance costs and constraints on how much an average working parent is able to pay, limit the profitability of child care as a business.

The State of California can take a more active role in encouraging a wide variety of solutions to the child care dilemma. One set of remedies includes a wide variety of support services that may enable parents to care for their own children. A job-protected parental leave, after the birth or adoption of a child, is one such support. A growing number of parents, usually mothers of infants, are faced with the dilemma of having to work to support their family while being denied the option of staying home with their infant. This situation is compounded by very limited available care that is often extremely costly.

Both public and private employers have been slow to offer child care services as a benefit to their employees. The benefit need not add to employer cost but can be offered "cafeteria-style" enabling the employee to decide which benefits best fit his or her needs. While child care centers, either on or near the worksite are one way to offer this employee benefit, other options include offering "vouchers" to be used at a location of the employees choice and to offer more flexible work schedules for employees who desire them.

Tax incentives, public lands, bond issues, guaranteed loans, and income deferment programs are other ways that the State might encourage employer-sponsored child care services. Moreover, it is necessary for employers to recognize that worksite child care has been highly correlated with improved recruitment, employee retention and reduced absenteeism.

FINDING #17: HIGH QUALITY CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS FOR DISADVANTAGED CHILDREN CAN RESULT IN SIGNIFICANT LONG-TERM SAVINGS FOR THE STATE.

While many studies have documented the benefits of high quality child development programs for disadvantaged children, the most comprehensive longitudinal study was conducted by High/Scope Educational Research Foundation. Their exceptionally well-researched work, The Perry Preschool Program and its Long-Term Effects: A Benefit-Cost Analysis, showed dramatic benefits for both society-at-large and the children that participated in the program.

The Perry Preschool Study tracked 123 three and four-year-old black children born between 1958 and 1962 until they were 19 years of age. More importantly, the children were selected on the basis of: low parental attainment and socio-economic status, and low scores on the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Test (61-88). Children were randomly assigned to either a "test" or "control" group, and those in the "test" group attended preschool programs designed to promote the "intellectual, social and physical development" of each child.

Compared with the control group, children who completed the Perry Preschool Program showed:

- Significantly higher scores on I.Q. and Achievement Tests at age 15.
- Reduced need for Special Education Classes.
- Substantially reduced school drop out rate.
- High percentage of high school graduation.
- Fewer teen pregnancies.
- Lower delinquency rates.
- Higher rate of self support.
- Higher employment rates.

The researchers of this study took the above results and converted them into economic benefits (which included costs avoided) and compared them with the combined costs of the preschool program (about $5,000 per year, per child) and the opportunity costs (the value of the invested dollars that could not be used for other purposes) and concluded that for every $1,000 invested in the Perry Preschool Program, $4,130 (after inflation) has or will be returned to society. Furthermore, the lifetime benefit/cost ratio for children who attended one year of preschool was almost six to one.

California does not have any longitudinal studies of this caliber that provide comparisons of costs and benefits for child care programs. However, it is probable that programs of equal quality in California could enjoy similar success. The High/Scope Education Research Foundation's data provided dramatic evidence that high quality models work and save money.

FINDING #18: MAJOR FACTORS EXIST THAT AFFECT THE QUALITY OF CHILD CARE.

Characteristics within the child care setting are highly correlated with the well-being of children in care. Four particular characteristics are of special importance: caregiver to child ratios, group size, caregiver training and qualifications, as well as the program environment and services offered to children and families. These characteristics affect the well being of children in child care.

Although not currently regulated by the State, group size in child care centers is an important component to quality child care. Preschool-aged children who are cared for in small groups (with other quality components) tend to engage in more creative, verbal, and cooperative activity. They also tend to do better on some standardized tests than children in larger groups. Preschool children in larger groups are often observed aimlessly wandering about and exhibiting more aggressive behavior.

Child to caregiver ratios highly influence many aspects of the child care environment. In small groups with a small number of children per adult, children receive more attention, particularly in terms of small clusters of two to nine children. The management of children is also improved in small groups as well as in larger groups with high caregiver-to-child ratios.

The importance of ratios is particularly acute for infant care. Infant studies, performed in orphanages forty years ago demonstrate the affects of inadequate caregiver attention. Infants who received adequate nutrition and health attention but, because of understaffing, were denied the benefit of social stimulation (including being held, smiled at, spoken to) suffered irreparable harm. Separate studies confirmed that infants born normal and healthy but denied social stimulation suffered drastically increased morbidity rates, chronic medical problems and serious social ailments later in life. This phenomenon is so widely recognized that physicians have diagnosed it as failure to thrive.

According to the National Day Care Study, caregivers years of formal education, college degrees and years of general work experience, have little affect on the quality of child care. However, caregivers who have education or training specifically related to young children (e.g., child psychology, child development or education, day care) provide better social and intellectual stimulation to children than other caregivers. Additionally, children in their care score higher on standardized tests. Caregiver characteristics are highly correlated with the quality of the program offered to the child.

Staffing characteristics strongly influence the child care environment. In the interest of providing a stable environment for children, caregiver consistency is important. Because of the low pay and limited employee benefits often associated with child care work, caregivers have a turnover rate of 43 to 57 percent. Thus, children may have numerous changes in their principal caregivers each year. This can be devastating to young children who have developed strong attachments to the person with whom they spend most of their weekday waking hours.

Offering support services as part of child care programs can promote increased communication between child care providers and parents and enhance the child's well being. Often referred to as "parent services" these services can include: care for the child with mild illness, parenting workshops, and community health and service referrals. These services can benefit the entire family by reducing the risk of family problems and contributing to the overall well-being of children. A 1985 study by W. Paul Harder found that parent services to prevent crises such as family breakup and child abuse can save the state $240 per year for every family served.

Quality developmental child care programs do make a difference. High caregiver to child ratios, small group size, appropriate caregiver training, and high-quality child development programs and services combine to show the following affects in children:

- o Increased intellectual and language development;
- o High levels of social adjustment;
- o Increased cooperation between children and children with adults; and
- o Higher frequencies of touching and laughing with caregiver.

FINDING #19: SKYROCKETING INSURANCE COSTS COULD REDUCE THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN SERVED AND THE QUALITY OF CHILD CARE PROGRAMS.

Since 1984, private and public entities alike have faced increased liability insurance premiums ranging from 100 to 9000 percent, or in many cases an inability to obtain coverage at any price. The impact on child care providers has been equally significant and devastating. As a result, private providers are faced with three choices: to raise rates, to cut services or employee benefits; or to go out of business. Since reimbursement rates for State subsidized child care programs are based in part on actual costs, the result is that fewer children are served. This problem is further compounded by the fact that lump sum payments are difficult for providers because they are unable to immediately pass the large one time cost on to the consumer by increasing fees.

The basic problem for child care providers is that they have been caught in a "ground swell" of rapidly rising rates for other industries that far exceed actuarial losses for child care facilities. This practice continues because the insurance companies are not required to consider prior practices and claims history of child care facilities when establishing rates or denying coverage. Thus, insurance companies today often lump all insureds together regardless of how often this particular industry has been sued.

FINDING #20: LACK OF CONSISTENT GOALS AND GUIDELINES FOR CHILD CARE SERVICES.

There are significant differences among the programs currently offered by the Department of Social Services and the Department of Education. Viewed in the broad sense they share certain similarities, such as providing children with a safe and supervised environment, offering a range of child development activities, and enabling parents to work to support their family. But these similarities fade by comparison with differences among programs, especially those differences that relate to the age and individual needs of the children. To make a program-by-program analysis of each program's goals and ultimately its benefits and costs goes beyond the scope of the Commission's charge at this time. However, taking the time to identify and reflect on the State's child care goals, broad as they may be, provides insights into the breadth of intended public purposes. These broad purposes are often lost in the heat of policy debate over the budget or when the focus is on only one aspect of child care, such as enabling parents to seek employment.

A logical starting point for this review is existing State laws. Beginning with the State Education Code, there is no one section that identifies "goals" for all State programs, nor are they to be found within the authorizations for individual programs on any consistent basis. Section 8201, which sets forth the purposes of child care, provides guidance in that it summarizes legislative intent, program goals and operational goals:

a. To provide a comprehensive, coordinated and cost-effective system of child care and development for children to age 14 and their parents, including a full range of supervision, health and support services through full and part-time programs.

b. To encourage community-level coordination in support of child care and development services.

c. To provide an environment that is healthy and nurturing for all children in child care and development programs.

d. To provide the opportunity for positive parenting to take place through understanding of human growth and development.

e. To reduce strain between parent and child in order to prevent abuse, neglect or exploitation.

f. To enhance the cognitive development of children, with particular emphasis upon those children who require special assistance, including bilingual capabilities to attain their full potential.

g. To establish a framework for the expansion of child care and development services.

This statement of legislative purpose, with its heavy child development emphasis, supports the view that the State's child care programs need to include child development and parenting components. Note that the goal of enabling parents to work is not explicitly mentioned. The Governor's Budget, however, provides a different emphasis, accentuating work and family sufficiency.

The Governor's Budget for 1987-88 identifies the following major goals for the State's Child Care Programs:

a. To assist families in becoming self-sufficient by enabling parents to work or receive training to lead to employment by providing safe and appropriate environments for children.

b. To enhance the physical, emotional and developmental growth of participating children.

c. To refer families in need of medical or family support to appropriate agencies.

Thus, with inconsistent child care policies at the State level, it is difficult to develop programs and budgets that are integrated and cost effective.

FINDING #21: THE NUMBER OF SUBSIDIZED CHILD CARE SPACES AVAILABLE ARE INSUFFICIENT TO SERVE THE WORKING POOR.

The lack of subsidized child care places many parents in the position of having to make a virtually impossible decision--adequate care and supervision for their children or unemployment. The effects of either choice can be catastrophic. Estimates of the shortage of subsidized care vary widely. While debates over "quality vs. cost" continue, this problem endures.

Families or children eligible to receive State subsidized child care include:

- o Families on public assistance;
- o Families with a monthly income at or below 84% of the State median income, as adjusted for family size; and
- o Children who have or are at risk of being abused or neglected as determined by and referred by a legal, medical, or social services agency.

In addition to the above eligibility criteria, families must establish a need for subsidized child care services in accordance with criteria set forth in Education Code Section 8263. These criteria include parents' employment status, incapacity of either parents or children, and the need for, or participation in, child protective services. Once eligibility has been established the child typically is placed on a waiting list. An abused or neglected child receives first priority for available child care spaces. Other eligible families are placed on the waiting list by income, children from the poorest families are placed above those that are, relatively, more fortunate. If space becomes available and the child enters the subsidized program he or she can remain until family income reaches 100 percent of the California median.

It is important to note that families of children in subsidized programs pay fees on a sliding-fee schedule. For example, a family of three at the 84 percent median income level of $1,604 per month (just below the eligibility cutoff point), would pay a daily fee of $5.80 which amounts to $127.60 per month for full-time child care. Whereas, a family of three with monthly income of $955 would pay a daily fee of $.50 which amounts to $11.00 per month for full-time child care. Families with more than one child needing subsidized care are assessed fees for only one child.

Drastic shortages in subsidized programs coupled with unlikely funding increases to adequately expand the supply have prompted the Commission to consider possible ways to expand subsidized child care services.

One option for filling the unmet demand for child care within budget constraints would be to increase the existing fee schedule so that more families and children could be served or establish a limit on the number of years that families can receive subsidized child care. Other options would be to reduce the median income requirement and to discontinue services to families whose incomes exceed the 84 percent ceiling. These proposals would reduce the pool of eligible children by removing those who are supposedly the best able to pay. These alternatives reflect attempts to address the issue of "equity", based upon the service priorities defined under existing law and given the limitations on funding. However, critics contend that these options result in a revolving door forcing the working poor to revert to public assistance.

Equity issues must be balanced against the possible hardships these alternatives might impose upon children and families. For example, it is possible that family income could fluctuate just above and below the income cut-off point. In a case like this, would the child be burdened with frequent drifts in and of the program? If a child were terminated from the program, would a lack of affordable alternative child care options force a parent into unemployment? These and other important questions need to be addressed before recommendations can be made. Furthermore, there are other issues to consider in the crucial need to expand subsidized child care. For instance, none of these alternatives address the underlying policy question concerning the consequences, especially future costs and benefits, of not meeting the total demand for subsidized child care.

FINDING #22: THE ADMINISTRATIVE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE QUALITY AND COST OF PROVIDING CHILD CARE HAVE NOT BEEN RECONCILED.

Given the existing funding constraints, child care professionals disagree on how to solve the problem of the limited availability of child care. The primary issues involve quality standards and relative costs, and how they effect administration and equity.

Sections 8201, 8202, and 8203 of the California Education Code require cost-effective and high quality child care. The law mandates specific quality requirements for program standards, staffing ratios and staff qualifications. Specifically, "quality" as it has been defined takes precedence over "quantity" when demands for services exceed budgeted resources. Because these "quality" requirements entail additional costs, some private providers view them as unfair and unrealistic. These critics argue that it would be preferable to serve more children, even if it means at a somewhat lowered standard, rather than not to serve some children at all. Some also contend that it is not necessary to sacrifice quality because they consider the current requirements for staff qualifications and staffing ratios to be unnecessarily high. However, a primary question that must be addressed is how many more children could be served even if "quality" requirements were decreased. Exhibit V.1 provides a comparison of existing staffing ratios and staff qualifications in California.

As this Exhibit V.1 illustrates, child care programs and facilities in California are governed by two sets of standards: Title 5 of the Education Code and Title 22 of the Health and Safety Code. Each is administered by one of two separate agencies -- the State Department of Education and the Department of Social Services.

Exhibit V.1

COMPARISON OF TITLE 5 AND TITLE 22 STANDARDS FOR STAFFING AND STAFF QUALIFICATIONS AT CHILD CARE CENTERS

STAFFING RATIOS

Title 5:	Adult: Child	Teacher: Child
Age Range-		
Infants (0 to 2 years old)	1:3	1:18
Infants/Toddlers (0 to 3)	1:4	1:16
Children (3 to 6)	1:8	1:24
Children (6 to 10)	1:14	1:28
Children (10 to 14)	1:18	1:36

Title 22:	Teacher/Adult: Child
Age Range-	
Infants (0 to 2 years old)	1:4
Children (2+ years)	1:12
With 1 aid (2+ years)	1:15
School age (6 - 12)	1:15

QUALIFICATIONS

Title 5: Teachers must have a Children's Center Permit, at least a two-year degree and 24 units of early childhood education in specified course areas and variable amounts of experience.

Title 22: Teachers must have 12 units of early childhood education in specified course areas and variable amounts of experience.

In addition to the basic health and safety provisions found in Title 22 that apply to all licensed centers, including private child care centers, both Title 5 and 22 have different requirements for caregiver to child ratios and staff qualifications. Adult to child ratios for family home day care, which are set by the Department of Social Services, differ from those prescribed for child care centers.

As shown in Exhibit V.1 the teacher qualifications prescribed by the Title 5 requirements are over twice that required of the Title 22 teacher. These increased credential requirements may be partially offset by the lower teacher to child ratios prescribed for the Title 5 centers. For example, the teacher to child ratio for Title 5 children who are age 3 to 6 is 1:24, while the teacher to child ratio for Title 22 centers is 1:12. In addition, more non-teacher adult supervision may be utilized in the Title 5 centers.

Exhibit V.2 shows the range of rates and the average daily rates that the State Department of Education pays for different types of child care programs. It demonstrates that reimbursement rates can vary widely even within the same type of program. The State Department of Education states that the variation in rates is due to the fact that reimbursement rates cannot exceed the rate charged by the contractor to nonsubsidized children.

Exhibit V.2 further illustrates that Title 5 school district programs are the most costly, while the rates paid to private agencies and center based care facilities are considerably less. Child care experts point out that these differences are due to the fact that children with multiple problems, such as abused children referred by the children's protective services system who need more extensive programs, are served in the Title 5 programs. Interestingly, the rates paid to State migrant child care programs are less than all other types listed.

A frequent debate over child care quality revolves around the question of why state subsidized child care, a program serving the working poor, has higher standards and costs than non-subsidized care. Critics of this dual system maintain that it creates unequal treatment for children based solely on the source of funding, an artifact which makes the expansion of new programs more difficult and costly. Some assert that the so-called "Educational Model" fostered by the State Department of Education is responsible for higher costs. However, others indicate that the education model serves multi-problem families and provides more services and programs.

A recent study by the Child Development Division of the State Department of Education entitled, "The Cost of State Subsidized Child Care in California," concluded that the considerable variations in the costs among child care contractors could be explained by the amount of time each day that children were enrolled, the ages of children enrolled, the difference in the prices that contractors had to pay for resources, agency size, and the quantity and quality of services provided. The general conclusion was that "the current reimbursement system for Title 5 child care is sound."

Exhibit V.2

RANGE OF REIMBURSEMENT RATES PAID TO THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION BY TYPE OF CHILD CARE*

1985-86 DAILY RATES

Type of Program	Low	High	Average
General Child Care - School District	$14.70	$25.56	$18.38
General Child Care - Private Agencies	$13.65	$18.66	$17.64
Center Based Care	$ 9.99	$18.66	$16.82
State Migrant Child Care	$13.93	$18.66	$16.53

SOURCE: Compiled from data provided by the State Department of Education, Child Development Division.

* This data is based upon pre-finalized fiscal year data, therefore does not reflect rate increases, expansion funding, cost of living adjustments, or any other amendments.

FINDING #23: THE CHILD CARE NEEDS OF SPECIAL POPULATION GROUPS ARE NOT BEING MET.

There is a lack of adequate child care to serve low income minority families, families living in high density urban areas, children with disabilities and children determined to be at risk of neglect or abuse. The shortages in care to these Special Population Groups are evident in both subsidized and non-subsidized child care arrangements. The special needs of these populations are created by factors unique to the child or by those that are created by demographic circumstances. The result is that most Special Population Groups are not being equitably served.

Child care programs for the children of migrant farm workers are not meeting the desperate need for service. A recent study conducted by the Department of Education reported that the number of migrant children that qualify for subsidized child care exceeds 413,000 and that approximately 3,000 are being served. Researchers found that children aged three through six were being left alone for an average of 50 hours per week while their parents worked.

In high density urban areas, space, and other facility related regulations inhibit the availability of child care facilities. Outdoor and indoor space is typically limited in high density urban centers, preventing child care centers, as well as family day care homes from meeting standardized licensing requirements. There is also inadequate outreach to assist those who could meet existing standards in these urban areas. As a result, the limited amount of child care in these areas cannot meet the standardized licensing requirements and is often unlicensed.

Another special population group that is not being properly served includes children who are at risk of neglect or abuse. Section 8263 of the Education Code requires that these children be given first priority for subsidized child care services. However, because subsidized facilities are usually filled, long delays are not uncommon. A report by the Auditor General issued in June 1986, stated that children at risk of neglect or abuse "often must wait two months or more before they are enrolled in a subsidized child care program." The report further added that three of seven respite care contractors contacted indicated that "children must wait an average of one year for subsidized child care."

Still another special population that is tremendously underserved is the one that includes exceptional children, or those with developmental disabilities. An April 1983 report, issued by The Child Development Programs Advisory Committee, stated that there is currently no State policy that directs, shapes or assists a parent's search for child care for an exceptional child. Furthermore, if parents of exceptional school-aged children, five through fourteen years of age, participate in the labor force in the same proportion as parents of non-handicapped children, then up to 130,000 school-aged exceptional children would need care and supervision for part of the day.

CHAPTER VI
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDED PLAN OF ACTION

This chapter presents the Commission's general conclusions in its study of the Children's Services System in California. It also presents the Commission's recommendations and intended plan of action to deal with the problems and issues identified in the study.

CONCLUSIONS

California's children's services system spends more than $5.9 billion annually, excluding State funds for K-12 education. Of this amount, approximately $1.2 billion is earmarked for programs serving neglected and abused, runaway/homeless children, and children in need of child care. In addition, millions of dollars are spent annually by private agencies.

The Commission found that California's children's services system is comprised of a cumbersome structure of State and local departments, agencies, and programs that do not effectively serve the needs of the State's children. Moreover, due in part to a lack of leadership, direction, accountability and control, many children are not receiving the continuum of services and care that they need.

Recent changes in legislation and public information campaigns combined with sweeping economic and social changes in our State, have dramatically increased the need for and the demands on children's service providers. However, due to California's fragmented and uncoordinated children's services delivery system, inequitable distribution of funding, and limited resources, hundreds of thousands of children in need do not receive the services necessary for their proper care. Moreover, the present children's services delivery system results in inequities in service levels, disproportionate costs of services, wasted resources, and gaps in service delivery.

Although the availability of resources is of prime concern, there needs to be a conscientious rethinking and restructuring of California's children's services system to provide the coordination and leadership that is necessary to adequately serve the 6.9 million children in California. This will ensure that current funds are spent wisely and that the need for any additional funding can be adequately assessed and documented. Specifically, the children's services system must recognize that each child that enters the State's children's services system has a market basket of needs that are not being fully addressed by compartmentalized program delivery systems. Moreover, a children's services system that addresses the needs of the "whole" child must be established to enable children to receive the services they need to become responsible productive members of our society.

Furthermore, the Commission believes that the provision of children's services is the crisis of the 1980s and, if left untreated, will negatively effect the future economic and social well-being of California.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The Little Hoover Commission believes that the State of California needs to take definitive actions to remedy the severe problems that have developed in the State's children's services system in recent years. Moreover, in the absence of decisive and dramatic changes in our children's services delivery system, an increasing number of children with critical needs will go unserved.

The Commission believes that the State needs to address the current problems in its system of providing children's services so that the State can eliminate the tremendous inequities in service levels, the disproportionate costs of services, the wasted resources, and the gaps in service delivery that presently exist. Specifically, the Commission recommends:

1. The State of California should adopt a uniform children's services policy that addresses the needs of the "whole" child.

   The various State agencies that are involved in providing services to children each have their own goals, objectives and priorities. Moreover, the different programs are designed to serve different aspects of a child's needs. Thus, there is no overriding State policy to provide guidance and direction for children's services. The adoption of a uniform children's services policy by the State that addresses the needs of the "whole" child, as opposed to only parts of a child's needs, will provide policy guidance that is currently absent.

2. The State of California should develop an integrated and cohesive structure for the delivery of children's services by State departments.

   The State's present organizational structure for delivering children's services is the result of piecemeal growth of programs and responsibilities over the past four decades. This fragmented growth has resulted in a compartmentalized organizational structure at the State level that makes it difficult, if not impossible, to obtain the full range of services needed by children or their families. A streamlined, integrated and cohesive children's services system is needed to ensure that children have adequate access to services and that individual State departments can be held accountable for program results.

3. The State of California should develop a coordinated network for the delivery of children's services.

   There are a multitude of public and private agencies at the State and local levels that are involved in the delivery of services to children. However, there is currently only limited interaction, coordination and planning of service delivery among these agencies. This results in various problems in service delivery, such as duplication of services or gaps in services. Moreover, it makes it very difficult to ensure that an individual child in need of services has access to services and obtains them. The development of a more coordinated network for the delivery of children's services will result in a more cost-effective delivery of services.

4. The State of California should conduct a detailed assessment of the funding requirements of its children's services delivery system.

   The State's current children's services delivery system is beset by a host of problems, including a lack of overall policy direction, poor organizational configuration, and a lack of service coordination. Once the State has addressed the policy and structural problems in the children's services system, it must then conduct a detailed assessment of the level of funding necessary to fulfill the State's policy objectives. In addition, this assessment should include an evaluation of the staffing levels, training programs, and wage structure for children's services workers.

5. The Governor and the Legislature should modify certain provisions of Senate Bill 14 that relate to neglected and abused children.

   The current system for investigating and processing potential cases of child abuse and neglect requires immediate attention due to the significant growth in cases being reported and the associated workload requirements. Specifically, the provisions established by Senate Bill 14 should be modified as follows:

   a. Provide more flexible investigative time limits;

   b. Direct the Department of Social Services in conjunction with counties and children's rights advocates to establish guidelines for conducting investigations;

   c. Amend Section 300 of the Welfare and Institutions Code to include guidelines for case priorities and social worker caseloads;

   d. Provide that, whenever possible, one social worker is given the responsibility to follow each case through the court system; and

   e. Direct the Department of Social Services to establish a training program regarding the provisions of Senate Bill 14 and its intent.

6. The State of California should consider the need for major revisions in its current system for providing services to neglected and abused children.

The State's child protective service system has in many ways become the place of "last resort" for children in need of services. While many of the children referred to child protective services may be desperately in need of help, they may be better served by other children's service providers. To ensure that neglected and abused children are well-served and to control the chaos in the State's present child protective services system, the State of California should consider the appropriateness of making major long-term revisions in its child protective services system. Presently, the Senate Select Committee on Children and Youth is actively involved in reviewing the need for major changes in the State's child protective services system. As part of its overall review efforts, the State should:

a. Review the need for and the problems associated with a more narrow definition of child abuse;

b. Review Section 300 of the Welfare and Institutions Code to determine whether stricter or more specific requirements are necessary for a finding of dependency, including an evaluation of the degree of harm to the child;

c. Analyze conditions and make recommendations concerning conditions when a police officer or social worker may remove children from their homes without a court order;

d. Identify strategies to assist public and private social agencies to better manage the assessment and investigation of reports of child abuse;

e. Review the present array of training requirements, courses, and methods available to assist those required to report, investigate, or to make recommendations regarding child abuse, including:

    - Training in reporting for mandated reporters, such as teachers, school nurses, ministers, psychologists, physicians, etc.;

    - Training in interviewing and investigating allegations of abuse or neglect for professionals in social work, law enforcement, and corrections;

    - Training regarding child abuse treatment and prevention in professional education, both in continuing education for those already practicing and in professional schools for those planning to practice;

    - Interdisciplinary workshops to transfer skills and knowledge among those who work closely with abused children; and

- Judicial training for judges and other professionals involved in the court process.

f. Review the State's current policies, practices, and funding approach regarding foster care. Specifically conduct a "rethinking" of foster care's purpose, operations, and benefits, and make recommendations regarding:

  - Recruitment;
  - Training;
  - Licensing regulations;
  - Compensation/rates;
  - Special needs placement; and
  - Linkages to respite care and child care services.

g. Analyze alternatives to foster care placement and institutional settings, including:

  - Establishing special purpose foster care;

  - Establishing foster care that would operate in conjunction with institutional facilities; and

  - Establishing special purpose day care as an alternative to out-of-home placement.

h. Assess the effectiveness of current treatment programs, including child abuse prevention programs.

i. Analyze alternatives for improving the quality of services and reducing State costs, including:

  - For metropolitan areas, examine the use of regional intake centers which would house a variety of public and private agencies able to collaborate in devising a service plan for neglected and abused children;

  - For areas of lesser population concentration or where jurisdictional boundaries pose barriers, examine the potential for jointly operated programs and facilities which would realize economies in treatment and operation; and

  - Examine the problem of public/private cooperation at the local level to identify examples of successful interagency collaboration and joint planning in assuring the provision of services to neglected and abused children and determine how this experience can be transferred.

j. Assess the State's present priorities for funding specific services for neglected and abused children, including the consideration of future social costs to society, such as costs to mental health systems and correctional facilities.

k. Assess current models of abuse prevention and treatment programs.

7. The Office of Criminal Justice Planning should provide an evaluation of the two homeless pilot projects funded pursuant to AB 1596 by August 1, 1987.

The Office of Criminal Justice Planning is currently overseeing the operation of two homeless pilot projects as mandated by AB 1596. To ensure that the results of these pilot projects can be fully used in current policy discussions on children's services, an evaluation of the pilot projects should be available by August 1, 1987 and include a review of the following:

a. Effectiveness of outreach;
b. Effectiveness of coordination between agencies;
c. Ability to secure access to treatment services;
d. Success of treatment outcomes;
e. Public/private agency relations;
f. Access to services; and
g. Identification of additional services that are needed.

8. The State of California should evaluate alternative models of service for runaway/homeless and multi-problem youth.

The State of California's children's services system currently is not well-designed to provide service to runaway/homeless and multi-problem youth. As a result, many of these children "fall between the cracks" in the current service delivery system. To meet the needs of these children more fully, the State should analyze and consider using various models of service delivery, including:

a. Using Multi-disciplinary Assessment Teams (MAT), coordinated by representatives of concerned local agencies, to accept referrals for service where need for services are not being met by existing agency programs. For example, a high-risk youth education model is currently being considered by the Senate Select Committee on Children and Youth;

b. Using a model of service delivery that is responsive to the unique local needs of different areas of the State; and

c. Using a model of service that provides flexibility in the creation of independent programs to meet the needs of minors and accommodate local preferences and resources.

9. The State of California should determine if the need exists for a specific legal mandate to provide services to homeless youth.

   Based upon the results of the analysis of the effectiveness of the emergency shelter programs authorized under AB 1596 and the evaluation of the potential service models, the State of California should determine if continuous funding should be appropriated to serve the homeless youth population. Specifically, the State needs to decide if the funding for the pilot programs under AB 1596 should receive continued funding and/or whether the program should be expanded to other locations, or if it should be adopted on a statewide basis.

10. The Governor and the Legislature should require local school districts to increase their efforts to make space for child care facilities more available.

    The State of California has a tremendous shortage of space available for child care facilities. To help resolve this space shortage, the State should require that local school districts do the following:

    a. Include provisions for child care facilities as a part of all new construction;

    b. Identify, publicize, and make available to qualified public and private caregivers any classrooms or other school facilities that are not presently needed for K-12 education and are suitable for child care purposes;

    c. Make a determination that surplus school facilities are not needed or are not suitable for child care purposes prior to their disposal; and

    d. Make facilities available before and after school where a sufficient need for such child care exists.

11. The Governor and the Legislature should require that future construction and major renovation of public buildings provide suitable space for child care facilities.

    Due to the lack of adequate space available for child care needs in the State, the State should take a more proactive role in making space available. Specifically, the State should require that all public buildings with 700 or more eligible employees who have a continuing annual need for child care over the next ten years provide child care spaces.

12. The State of California should implement an exemplary child care program for its employees, including flexible employment policies.

    As the largest employer in the State, the State of California should establish a model child care program for other employers to emulate. Specifically, this program should include the following:

    a. Establishment of on-site, or adjacent, child care facilities;

    b. Establishment of a cafeteria style benefit package which includes child care benefits;

    c. Establishment of income deferment programs for child care benefits.

13. If voluntary insurance industry participation to provide insurance for child care centers is deemed inadequate, the Insurance Commissioner should be provided the authority to compel insurers to participate.

    The State of California has been faced with an availability and affordability crisis regarding commercial liability insurance in recent years. This has been particularly true for child care providers. If voluntary insurance industry participation to provide insurance for child care centers is inadequate, the Insurance Commissioners should have the authority to compel insurers to provide such insurance.

14. The Governor and the Legislature should require insurance companies to consider prior industry practices and claims history when establishing rates for child care facilities.

    The insurance premiums for child care providers have increased dramatically in recent years, far outstripping the increases warranted by prior claims history of child care providers. To mitigate against unwarranted insurance rate increases, insurance companies should be required to take prior industry claims history into consideration when establishing rates for child care centers.

15. The State of California should further define the elements of quality child care and determine how to incorporate these elements in child care programs.

    There is considerable debate regarding the impact of various factors, such as child to teacher ratios and group size, on the quality of child care. The State should further revise and define the elements of quality child care and, where appropriate, incorporate beneficial elements in child care programs. Specifically, the State should:

a. Evaluate the elements of quality child development and parent education and support programs that should be required in child care;

b. Develop innovative programs to provide capital outlay funding for child care facilities;

c. Review the need to develop maternal leave and flexible and part-time employment policies and practices for parents of infants;

d. Review the need to develop on-site or near-site child care facilities in business and industry;

e. Identify types of research that should be performed to assess the benefits of child care;

f. Determine if California should adopt the National Day Care Study Standards for group size; and

g. Continue to analyze child care policies, programs, benefits, financing, quality standards, delivery systems, administrative procedures, and organizational responsibilities, including recommendations for improvements and a time/task schedule for implementation.

PLAN OF ACTION

The Commission has identified 15 recommendations that should be carried out to improve the children's services delivery system in California. As previously mentioned, the Commission's study is a two-phase study. Phase I focused on identifying "what" the major problems are in children's services in California. This preliminary report summarizes the findings of Phase I of the study. Phase II of the study will include a detailed review of "how" to address the current problems in children's services in California.

The plan of action shown in Exhibit VI.1 provides a summary listing of the Commission's recommendations from Phase I of the study, the responsible agency for acting on each recommendation, and the implementation time frame.

The final report that will be issued at the end of Phase II of the study is scheduled to be released in August 1987. This report will include the complete findings of the Commission relating to children's services in California and will include the results of additional detailed study performed by the Commission in Phase II of the study.

EXHIBIT VI.I

Commission on California State Government
Organization and Economy
Children's Services Study

ACTION PLAN

	RECOMMENDATION	RESPONSIBILITY	IMPLEMENTATION ACTION
1.	Adopt a Uniform Children's Services Policy	Little Hoover Commission	Phase II Study
2.	Develop an Integrated and Cohesive Structure for Delivering Children's Services	Little Hoover Commission	Phase II Study
3.	Develop a Coordinated Network for Delivering Children's Services	Little Hoover Commission	Phase II Study
4.	Conduct a Detailed Assessment of Funding Requirements	Little Hoover Commission	Phase II Study
5.	Modify Certain Provisions of Senate Bill 14	Governor and Legislature	Immediate Action
6.	Consider Major Revisions in Current System for Providing Services to Neglected and Abused Children	Little Hoover Commission	Phase II Study
7.	Evaluate the Homeless Pilot Projects Mandated by Assembly Bill 1596	Office of Criminal Justice Planning	Complete by August 1, 1987
8.	Evaluate Alternative Models of Service for Homeless/Runaway and Multi-problem Youth	Little Hoover Commission	Phase II Study
9.	Determine Need for Specific Mandate to Provide Services to Homeless Youth	Little Hoover Commission	Phase II Study
10.	Require Local School Districts to Increase Efforts to Make Space Available for Child Care Facilities	Governor and Legislature	Immediate Action
11.	Require Future Construction and Major Renovation of Public Buildings Provide Suitable Child Care Space	Governor and Legislature	Immediate Action
12.	Implement an Exemplary Child Care Program for State of California Employees	Governor and Legislature	Immediate Action
13.	Provide Insurance Commissioner the Authority to Compel Insurers to Provide Insurance for Child Care Centers if Industry Participation Is Inadequate	Governor and Legislature	Immediate Action
14.	Require Insurance Companies to Consider Claims History When Establishing Rates for Child Care Facilities	Governor and Legislature	Immediate Action
15.	Further Define the Elements of Quality Child Care and Incorporate in Child Care Programs	Little Hoover Commission	Phase II Study

APPENDIX A

CHILDREN'S SERVICES BLUE RIBBON ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Mrs. Jean Kindy Walker
Commissioner
Little Hoover Commission
Chairman, Children's Services Subcommittee

Mr. Albert Gersten, Jr.
Commissioner
Little Hoover Commission

Mr. Haig Mardikian
Commissioner
Little Hoover Commission

Mr. Abraham Spiegel
Commissioner
Little Hoover Commission

The Honorable Tom Bates
Member of the Assembly

The Honorable Marian Bergeson
Member of the Senate

The Honorable Sunny Mononnier
Member of the Assembly

The Honorable David A. Roberti
Member of the Senate

Ms. Hida Avent, Director
Stepping Stones
Santa Monica, California

Mr. Sam Berman
Executive Director
Vista Del Mar
Los Angeles, California

Ms. Susan Brock
Executive Director
The Children's Alliance
Sacramento, California

Mr. Jerry Buck
Chief Probation Officer
Contra Costa County
Martinez, California

Mr. Robert Chaffee
Director
Department of Children's Services
County of Los Angeles

Mr. Tony Cimarusti
Assistant Director
Crime and Delinquency Prevention
Sacramento, California

Ms. Nancy Daly
Los Angeles Children's Commission
Bel Air, California

Mr. Thomas David, Ph.D.
Children's Hospital
Los Angeles, California

Mr. Jed Emerson
Executive Director
Larkin Street Youth Center
San Francisco, California

Ms. Patricia Gardner
Department of Education
Sacramento, California

Mr. Paul Green
Probation Department
Oakland, California

Mr. George Al Howenstein Jr.
Executive Director
Office of Criminal Justice Planning
Sacramento, California

Dr. Kenneth Kizer
Director
Department of Health Services
Sacramento, California

Ms. Kathy Kubota, M.S.W.
National Association of Social Workers
Pasadena, California

Ms. Antonia Lopez
The Migrant Coalition
Foundation Center
Sacramento, California

Ms. Sara Maina
Executive Director
Florence Crittenton Services
San Francisco, California

Ms. Rosemary Mans
Vice President
Bankamerica Foundation
San Francisco, California

Ms. Jacquelyn McCroskey, DSW
School of Social Work
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, California

Mr. Herb Paine
United Way of California
San Francisco, California

Ms. Nancy Pompei
Probation Department
Oakland, California

Brenda Posten
Catholic Social Services
San Francisco, California

Karen Hill Scott, Ph.D.
Crystal Stairs
Inglewood, California

Ms. Patricia Siegal
Director
Resource Referral Center
San Francisco, California

Ms. Melinda Sprague, Chair
Governor's Advisory
Committee on Child
Development Programs
Los Angeles, California

Ms. Deanne Tilton
State Social Services Board
El Monte, California

Mr. Ed Warren
Professional Association of
Childhood Education
San Francisco, California

Ms. Vivian Weinstein
Mayor's Advisory Committee
on Child Care
Los Angeles, California

Ms. Gale Wright
Department of Social Services
Sacramento, California

Mr. Gary Yates
High Risk Youth Project
Children's Hospital
Los Angeles, California

APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS, BY PROGRAM AND TARGET POPULATION CATAGORIES

Agency

Department of Social Services	Code*	State $ (in 1000's)	Federal $ (in 1000's)	Local $ (in 1000's)	Total $ (in 1000's)
AFDC-Family Group; Unemployed Parent	4	$1,767,732	$2,067,463	$ 307,325	$4,142,520
AFDC-Foster Care Program	1	275,705	93,863	22,291	391,859
Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Program	4	41,583	89,152	--	130,735
Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN)	3	24,611	24,609	--	49,220
Work Incentive Program (WIN)**	3	400	--	--	400
Refugee Assistance/Child Care	3	--	1,538	--	1,538
Unaccompanied Minor Program	1	--	2,843	--	2,843
Child Abuse Prevention Program	1	24,866	1,648	--	26,514
Agency/Independent Adoption Program	1	33,531	10,664	--	44,195
Child Welfare Services	1	164,712	63,967	55,259	283,938
Child Support Enforcement Program	4	19,732	130,854	3,618	154,204
Day Care Center & Family Day Care Home Licensing	3	15,847	--	--	15,847
Group Home, Foster Family Licensing	1	7,905	8,324	--	16,229
Subtotal DSS		2,376,624	2,494,925	388,493	5,260,042
Department of Education					
General Child Care	3	210,986	--	--	210,986
Migrant Child Development	3	6,616	2,140	--	8,756
State Preschool Program	3	37,022	--	--	37,022
Alternative Payment Programs	3	25,999	--	--	25,999
Child Care Resource and Referral Programs	3	7,335	--	--	7,335
Severely Handicapped Program	3	711	--	--	711
School-Aged Parenting & Infant Development (SAPID)	3	6,668	--	--	6,668
Campus Child Development	3	10,231	--	--	10,231
State Preschool Career Incentive Grant	3	300	--	--	300
Child Care & Employment Act (JTPA)	3	--	2,565	--	2,565
School-Age Community Child Care	3	15,629	--	--	15,629
Child Care Capital Outlay	3	43,750	--	--	43,750
Protective Services (Respite)	3	7,335	--	--	7,335
Subtotal SDE		372,582	4,705	--	377,287
Department of Mental Health					
State Hospitals and Local Programs Total	4	113,311	--	--	113,311
Department of Health Services					
Child Health & Disability Prevention	4	36,057	27,335	--	63,392
Adolescent Family Life Demonstration Program	4	1,818	3,182	--	5,000
High Risk Infant Follow-up Program	4	1,103	838	--	1,941
Subtotal DHS		38,978	31,355	--	70,333
California Youth Authority					
County Justice System Subvention	4	67,298	--	--	67,298

Agency Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs	Code*	State $ (in 1000's)	Federal $ (in 1000's)	Local $ (in 1000's)	Total $ (in 1000's)
School-Community Primary Prevention Program	4	1,091	--	--	1,091
Services for Drug Clients Age 18 & Younger	4	1,716	2,038	2,531	6,285
Children Recovery Services for Problems Related to Alcohol	4	370	54	200	624
Statewide Youth Coordination Project	4	117	--	--	117
Youth Technical Assistance Project	4	50	--	--	50
Public Awareness & Prevention Campaigns (Total)	4	499	14	--	513
Subtotal A&DP		3,843	2,106	2,731	8,680
Department of Housing & Community Development					
Emergency Shelter Program	2	3,880	--	--	3,880
University of California					
Campus Child Care Programs	3	1,101	--	2,401	3,502
California State University					
Campus Child Care Programs	3	1,306	--	2,160	3,466
California Community Colleges					
Cooperative Agencies Resources for Education	3	736	--	--	736
Campus Child Care Development Centers	3	4,026	--	--	4,026
Subtotal		4,762	--	--	4,762
Office of Criminal Justice Planning					
California Runaway Hotline	2	200	--	--	200
Homeless Youth Pilot Project	2	920	--	--	920
Child Sexual Abuse Prevention Program	1	250	--	--	250
Child Sexual Abuse Prevention Training Centers	1	700	--	--	700
Child Sexual Aubse & Exploitation Treatment Projects	1	334	--	--	334
Subtotal OCJP		2,404	--	--	2,404
Department of Justice					
Child Abuse Central Index	1	700	--	--	700

Agency	Code*	State $ (in 1000's)	Federal $ (in 1000's)	Local $ (in 1000's)	Total $ (in 1000's)
Child Developoment Program Advisory Committee	3	216	--	--	216
Total Neglected/Abused (Code 1)		508,703	181,309	77,550	767,562
Total Runaway/Homeless (Code 2)		5,000	--	--	5,000
Total Child Care (Code 3)		420,825	30,852	4,561	456,238
Total for Three Target Groups		934,528	212,161	82,111	1,228,800
Total Other Childrens Services (Code 4)		2,052,477	2,320,930	313,674	4,687,081
Grand Total-Childrens Services		2,987,005	2,533,091	395,785	5,915,881

*Legend

Code 1 = Programs specifically for Neglected and Abused Children
Code 2 = Programs specifically for Runaway/Homeless Youth
Code 3 = Child Care and Child Development Programs
Code 4 = Other Services for Children

**Figure represents only child care portion of program. Delineation of funding sources was not available.

APPENDIX C

CATALOG OF STATE GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS SERVING ABUSED AND NEGLECTED CHILDREN, RUNAWAY/HOMELESS YOUTH, AND CHILDREN IN NEED OF CHILD CARE

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Program

Aid to Families with Dependent Children
-Family Group (AFDC-FG)
-Unemployed Parent (AFDC-U)

Administered By:

Welfare Program Division

Statutory Authority

Welfare and Institutions Code, Sections 11000, 11050, 11201, 11205, 11250, 11450

Federal: SSA Title IV, Part A; 42 usc 601 et seq

Year Enacted: State: 1937; Federal: 1935

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	$ 8,114	$ 8,367	$ 0
Payments	$1,659,272	$1,861,493	$200,135
Other	$ 100,346	$ 197,603	$107,190
TOTALS	$1,767,732	$2,067,463	$307,325
Personnel years	248.9		

Estimated Clients Served

1,687,200 Persons

Objectives

To provide reasonable financial assistance to eligible, needy families with dependent children.

Eligibility

Eligibility is limited to those eligible families in which the children are deprived of one or both parents due to the parent's incapacity, death, other continuing absence, or to the unemployment of a parent. Eligibility is further linked to meeting other specified criteria as follows:

- must be a legal resident;
- family must have eligible child under the age of 19 years old (with limits for 18 year olds);
- must not have property valued in excess of $1,000, excluding primary residence and certain other personal property
- must not have gross income in excess of 185% of the Combined Minimum Basic Standard of Adequate Care (MBSAC) and the value of any special needs.

Program Activity

Under the state plan, the AFDC program in California is administered by the State Department of Social Services through county welfare departments. AFDC program benefits are provided to eligible families upon approval of application. Benefits consist primarily of cash assistance. Program services also include referrals to: family planning, child health and disability prevention, and other social services.

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Program

Aid To Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care (AFDC-FC) Program

Administered By:

Welfare Program Division

Statutory Authority

Public Law 96-272 (42 USC 671)
Welfare and Institutions Code, Sec. 11400 et seq
(Chapter 977, Statutes of 1982)

Year Enacted: Federal: 1980; State: 1982

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	$ 2,843	$ 2,317	$ 0
Payments	$ 265,293	$ 82,891	$ 14,177
Other (county administration)	$ 7,569	$ 8,655	$ 8,144
TOTALS	$ 275,705	$ 93,863	$ 22,291

Personnel years 99

Estimated Clients Served

Objectives

To provide maintenance payments for children who have been removed from their homes and placed in foster care. These children may be placed in foster family homes or in group homes, the latter generally offering more intensive treatment

Eligibility

In order to receive AFDC-FC payments, authority for placement must be established by: court order (dependency proceedings), relinquishment of parental rights (court proceeding), nonrelated legal guardianship (court proceeding), or voluntary placement supervised by the CWD. In addition, specified AFDC eligibility requirements (such as age, residence, child support referral, etc.,) must be met.

Program Activity

The AFDC-FC program provides statewide maintenance payments for children who require 24-hour out-of-home care because they are abused, neglected or exploited and their own families are unable or unwilling to care for them. Payments are made to the providers of board and care for these children. AFDC-FC eligible children must receive specified child welfare services which are funded under Title IV-B.

These services include:

- preplacement preventive services

- written assessment and service plan
- family reunification or permanent placement services
- six month visits by Care workers
- periodic reviews
- permanency planning hearings

The AFDC-FC program is administered nationally by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The state establishes eligibility standards for the state-only AFDC-FC program. The program is administered by the counties under the supervision of DSS. DSS establishes individual rates for group homes and homefinding agencies. Foster family home rates are established by age group category through the Budget Act.

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

The estimated average monthly caseload of children receiving AFDC-FC funding is 39,900

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Program

Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Program (SSI/SSP)

Administered By:

Welfare Program Division

Statutory Authority

Welfare & Institutions Code, Section 12200(f)
(Chapter 1216, statutes of 1973)

Year Enacted: 1973

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	$ 782	*	0
Payments	$ 40,801	$ 89,152	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$ 41,583	$ 89,152	0
Personnel years	9.7		

* Direct administrative costs are 100% federally funded; dollar amount unavailable

Estimated Clients Served

27,024 disabled minors (under 18 years of age and living with parent(s)). Figure is average monthly caseload from November, 1985 - October, 1986

Objectives

To provide financial assistance to aged, blind, or disabled California residents in supplementation of the federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefit. The SSI/SSP grant is intended to meet the recipient's basic needs of food, clothing and shelter and, through linked benefits, to provide assistance and services which will enlarge their opportunities or independence

Eligibility

Disabled minors must be under age 18, and have a physical or mental impairment that is comparable in severity to one that would prevent an adult from working and is expected to last at least 12 months or result in death.

Program Activity

The SSI/SSP program is a cash assistance program funded by both federal Social Security Administration (SSI) and state (SSP) monies. SSI/SSP is administered by the federal Social Security Administration (SSA) which takes applications at district offices throughout the state. SSA is responsible for determining eligibility, computing grants, and sending out the combined monthly federal/state benefit check. Administrative costs of the program are borne by the federal government. The state Department of Social Services monitors and provides input on SSA's program policy and procedure, federal and state legislative and regulatory proposals that affect the program; responds to inquires form the private and public sectors; manages the fiscal and budgetary aspects of the SSP Program; negotiates contract agreements with SSA; etc.

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Program

Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN)

Administered By:

Employment and Community Services Division,
Employment Programs Branch, GAIN Implementation
Bureau

Statutory Authority

Welfare and Institutions Code, Section 11320.36
(Chapter 1025, Statutes of 1985)

Year Enacted: 1985

Estimated 1986/87
Fiscal Year Expenditures
(in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administation	$ 2,061	$ 2,059	0
Payments (Allocations to counties)	$ 22,550	$22,550	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$ 24,611	$24,609	0
Personnel years	37.7		

It is estimated that the GAIN program will register 97,000 participants during SFY 1986-87. Also, it will cost approximately $13.1 million to reimburse these participants for child care costs during this period. In addition it is estimated that it will cost an additional $2.5 million to provide transitional child care cost reimbursement for those participants who acquire unsubsidized employment.

Estimated Clients Served

The total number of children served is estimated at 52,000. Approximately 10,000 children are to be served under transitional child care during 1986-1987.

Objectives

To provide a full range of employment-related services (including child care services) that are designed to provide Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program applicants and recipients with the types of skills that will allow them to acquire unsubsidized employment.

Eligibility

A GAIN participant with a child under 12 years of age who has indicated the need for child care. Reimbursement for costs is available for licensed child care or child care exempt from licensure

Program Activity

This program is state (and federal) funded, coordinated at the state level by the Employment and Community Services Division, and administered locally by county welfare departments (CWDs). The CWDs have the choice of directly providing child care services or contracting with existing public or private programs, such as Resource and Referral agencies, to provide any or all of the child care services. Participant costs are reimbursed up to the regional market rate as determined annually in accordance with local Resource and Referral programs and the Alternative Payment program administered by the State Department of Education. Advance payments are available to participants whenever necessary and desired by the participant. Payment for child care services is also available for a transition period of three months when a GAIN registrant terminates AFDC dependency due to unsubsidized employment.

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Program

Win Demonstration (WIN DEMO) Program-
(child care)

Administered By:

Employment Programs Branch

Statutory Authority

Welfare and Institutions Code, Section 11437
(Chapter 522, Statutes of 1984)

Year Enacted: 1984

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administation	$ 127	$ 687	0
Payments (County costs)	$ 9,354	$20,028	$ 753
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$ 9,481	$20,695	$ 753
Personnel years	14.6		

Note: It is estimated that approximately $400,000 annually is expended on child care services.

Estimated Clients Served

The number of WIN DEMO registrants at the end of June, 1986 totaled 206,000. Based on the estimated costs of child care included in the GAIN program, these funds would be adequate to provide child care services to approximately 300 children per month.

Objectives

To enable employable AFDC recipients to participate in employment activities while assuring that their children receive adequate child care at no cost to them.

Eligibility

Parents of children receiving WIN DEMO-funded child care must be AFDC recipients and must be participating in a WIN DEMO-funded or approved employment activity. Most able-bodied persons receiving AFDC who have no children under age six are required to participate in employment-related activities. Individuals who are not required to participate may do so voluntarily.

Program Activity

WIN DEMO child care is provided though vendor payment system for children of parents who are participants in approved WIN DEMO employment activities. Providers must be licensed or exempt from licensing.

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Program

Refugee Demonstration Project (RDP)
-Child Care

Administered By:

Employment and Community Services Division,
Office of Refugee Services, Refugee Employment
Programs Bureau, Policy Unit

Statutory Authority

Federal Authority: Fish Amendments to HR 3729
(Refugee Assistance Extension Act of 1983);

State Authority: Education Code, Section 8252
(Chapter 1352, Statutes of 1985)

Year Enacted: 1985

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	0	$ 137	0
Payments	0	$1,401	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	0	$1,538	0
Personnel years		N/A	

Estimated Clients Served

Caseload Data: 34,235

Objectives

To enable Refugees to participate in Refugee Demonstration Project employment activities, while assuring that their children receive adequate child care at no cost to them.

Eligibility

The RDP requirements were established using existing provisions contained in the Federal Refugee Cash Assistance Program in combination with mandatory participation in all available and appropriate employment training and placement programs

Program Activity

The intent of the RDP is to encourage refugees to accept entry level minimum wage jobs and to ensure their access to, and participation in , employment training and placement programs specifically designed for refugees.

Eligible RDP participants receive RDP Supportive Services consisting of child care, transportation, and work-related expenses if necessary to allow them to participate in employment and employment-related training services.

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Program

Unaccompanied Minor Program

Administered By:

Employment and Community Services Division,
Office of Refugee Services, Refugee Support
Management Bureau, Policy Unit

Statutory Authority

Federal Office of Refugee Resettlement
Child Welfare Regulations
(45 CFR Part 400,
Subpart H, Sections 400.110-120)

Year Enacted: 1986

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	0	$ 200	0
Payments	0	$2,643	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	0	$2,843	0
Personnel years		N/A	

Estimated Clients Served

Average Monthly caseload: 272

Objectives

To establish protective legal custody of unaccompanied refugee children and ensure the child receives the full range of child welfare benefits and services provided to non-refugee children in Foster Care.

Eligibility

Children are eligible for the Unaccompanied Minor Program if: they have not reached the age of majority; they have entered the country unaccompanied by a parent or immediate adult relative; have no parents in the country and; meets the definition of a Cuban or Haitian Entrant.

Program Activity

This program is federally funded and locally administered through the County Welfare Department which is vested with the primary responsibility for the child's welfare. Services may include, but not limited to: initial assessment and development of a service plan, coordination and supervision of the activities listed in the plan, referral to other service activities, and selection and placement activities to insure the appropriate placement of the child.

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Program

Child Abuse Prevention

Administered By:

Office of Child Abuse Prevention (OCAP)

Statutory Authority

Welfare and Institutions Code,
Section 18950-18979

Year Enacted: 1982-85

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	$ 1,928	$ 265	0
Payments	22,938	1,383	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$24,866	$1,648	0
Personnel years	30		

Estimated Clients Served

Population targeted for service varies from project to project, program to program. At their broadest, OCAP programs seek to reach the entire school age population with prevention services. At their most limited, they focus on a small number of high risk parents and seek to ameliorate explosive situations.

Objectives

To increase child abuse prevention activities (including those directed to professional training and public awareness); to improve communications among the various elements of the child abuse and neglect prevention network; to contribute to the body of knowledge in the area of child abuse and neglect; and to ensure equity in the geographic distribution of child abuse and neglect prevention resources.

Eligibility

All 6.8 million children in California are eligible for Child Abuse Prevention services. Emphasis is given to children under 14 years of age.

Program Activity

The Child Abuse Prevention and Intervention Program provides $10.4 million per annum for the funding of projects, through local, private non-profit organizations operating programs tailored to meet needs of locally defined priorities.

The Child Abuse Training Act of 1984 provides $10.2 million annually. Children in over 5,000 schools statewide form preschool through high school are being taught child abuse prevention skills in the classroom.

Innovative demonstration service models provide $1.5 million annually. Services provided by these three year funded projects include Intensive in-home services and training for families in which self-care of children is used.

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Program Activity

(continued)

Examples of State Children's Trust Fund Programs Include:

- Perinatal programs to enhance the positive bonding of high risk parents to prevent future abuse and neglect
- Production of training videos for the clergy and Hispanic community

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Program

Agency Adoption Program
Independent Adoption Program

Administered By:

Adult and Family Services Division
Adoptions Branch

Statutory Authority

California Civil Code, Sections 221-239; Welfare and Institutions Code, Sections 16100-16150, (Chapters 2-2.5)

Year Enacted: 1872* with substantial amendments to subsequent years

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration (state operations ONLY)	$ 6,697	$ 505	$ 0
Payments	12,107	3,936	0
Other (Local Assistance- Administration)	14,727	6,223	0
TOTALS	$33,531	$10,664	0
Personnel years (state only)	132.7		

Estimated Clients Served

Agency Adoptions: 2,599 Placements in FY 85/86; Independent Adoptions: 2,710 Court Reports Filed, approval recommended in 2120 cases.

Objectives

Agency Adoptions -to place children who are unable to be raised by their birth parents in suitable adoptive homes.

Independent Adoptions -to assure that when the placements are made by the birth parents, the adoptive family is suitable.

Eligibility

In general adoptive services are available to those in need of them. Subsidy is available to families adopting special-needs children who otherwise could not be placed for adoption.

Program Activity

Adoption Services are provided directly by the Department of Social Services, by licensed county adoption agencies and by private adoption agencies. Public agency services are provided by counties in large counties and by the state in small, rural counties. Independent adoptions are investigated by the state except in eight counties where the county adoption agency is responsible for the investigation. The Department has five contracts with private agencies for recruitment of minority adoptive homes and seven for maternity home care of pregnant minors.

Program

Child Welfare Services

Administered By

Family and Children Services Branch,
Adult and Family Services Division

Statutory Authority

Welfare and Institutions Code, Section 16500-16514, (Chapter 978, Statutes of 1982)

Year Enacted: 1982

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administation(1)	$ 1,941	$ 1,417	$ 0
Payments	0	0	0
Other(2)	162,771	62,550	55,259
TOTALS	$164,712	$63,967	$55,259

Personnel years(3) 53.4

(1) State Operations Only
(2) Local Assistance -Administration
(3) State Only

Estimated Clients Served

Program serves Children and Families
(figures represent Average monthly active cases)

Emergency Response Program:	27,549
Family Maintenance Program:	33,101
Family Reuinification Program:	21,215
Permanent Placement Program:	15,127

Objectives

To protect children from abuse, neglect and exploitation by providing services safely in the home, to remove the child if necessary and to reunite the child and family within specified time limits. If the child cannot by reunited with the family, to arrange as permanent a living situation as soon as possible

Eligibility

Any child reported to be, or in danger of being, abused, neglected or exploited.

Program Activity

This program is state supervised through the Family and Children Services Branch, Adult and Family Services Division, and locally administered through the County Welfare Departments. Eligibility and needs assessment are handled by the county. Four Service programs, provided by either the county or private contractors, include:

Emergency Response Program --provides initial intake services and crisis intervention through immediate in-person response, 24 hours a day, to reports of abuse, neglect, or exploitation

Family Maintenance Program --provides time-limited protective services to prevent or remedy child neglect, abuse, or exploitation. Services are provided to the child and family while the child remains in the home with caseworker supervision

Family Reunification Program --provides time-limited protective services when the child cannot safely remain at home while services are provided to reunite the family

Permanent Placement Program --provides and alternate permanent family structure for children who because of abuse, neglect, or exploitation cannot safely remain at home and who are unlikely to ever return home

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Program

Child Support Enforcement Program

Administered By:

Welfare Program Division
Child Support Program Management Branch

Statutory Authority

Welfare and Institutions Code, Section 11475
(Chapter 2, Statutes of 1975)

Year Enacted: 1975

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administation(1)	$ 2,913	$ 5,816	$ 0
Payments(2)	16,819	24,408	(41,227)
Other(3)	0	100,630	44,895
TOTALS	$ 19,732	$130,854	$ 3,618
Personnel years	70.8		

Estimated Clients Served

Total active caseload statewide: 940,480 cases
(welfare and nonwelfare)

Objectives

To enforce the obligation of parents to support their children and determine paternity in the case of a child born out of wedlock.

Eligibility

Services are provided for all children receiving public assistance (AFDC/Foster Care) where there is absent parent deprivation or where paternity has not been established.

Services are also provided on behalf of children who do not receive AFDC, upon completion of an application.

Program Activity

Clients are provided direct services for the location of absent parents, establishment of paternity, enforcement of support orders, and medical support enforcement. District attorneys utilize a variety of enforcement techniques including wage assignment, contempt actions, and tax intercepts

Support collections for aid related cases are assigned to the state and are used to reimburse assistance payments that have been paid to the family. Collections made on behalf of nonaided children are paid directly to the family.

The program provides services statewide through the local county offices, which operate under a Plan of Cooperation with SDSS.

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Program

Day Care Center and Family Day Care
Home Licensing

Administered By:

Community Care Licensing Division

Statutory Authority

California Child Day Dare Facilities Act, Health and Safety Code, Sections, 1596.70-1597.621

Prior to 1985, governed by the community Care Facilities Act, commencing with Section 1500

Year Enacted: 1985 Child Care Facilities Act
1973 Community Care Facilities Act

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration (state operations)	$11,923	0	0
Payments	0	0	0
Other (local assistance admin.)	$ 3,924	0	0
TOTALS	$15,847	0	0
Personnel years	220		

Estimated Clients Served

429,012 Day Care Center licensed capacity
227,130 Family Day Care Home licensed capacity

Objectives

To protect the health and safety of children in day care facilities by enforcing standards, screening applicants and taking administrative actions against those facilities which jeopardize the physical and/or mental welfare of children in care.

Eligibility

Children (birth through 17 years of age) in need of out-of-home care. Placement is voluntary on the part of parents.

Program Activity

Community Care Licensing program activities include the following:

- Application review/screening
- Complaint investigation
- Evaluation of facilities to determine compliance with licensing standards
- legal/administration actions against substandard facilities
- Orientations for potential applicants
- Renewal application screening and evaluation
- Renewal facility visits
- Follow-up facility visits to ensure the correction to previously cited deficiencies have been made (plan of Correction visits)
- Unlicensed facility visits

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES

Program

Group Homes, Small Family Homes, Foster Family Homes, Foster Family Agency, Adoption Agency Licensing

Administered By:

Community Care Licensing Division

Statutory Authority

Health and Safety Code, Section 1500
Civil Code, Sections 221-230.8

Year Enacted: 1973 Community Care Facilities Act

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	$ 3,832	$ 4,252	0
Payments	0	0	0
Other	$ 4,073	$ 4,072	0
TOTALS	$ 7,905	$ 8,324	0
Personnel years	70.7		

Estimated Clients Served

11,990	Group home Licensed capacity
4,720	Small Family Homes licensed capacity
25,340	Foster Family Home licensed capacity
56	Adoption Agencies licensed (no capacity limitations)

Objectives

To protect the health and safety of children in day care facilities by screening applicants, enforcing standards on a ongoing basis through facility visits, and taking administrative actions against those facilities which jeopardize the physical and/or mental welfare of children in care.

Eligibility

Children (birth through 17 years of age) in need of out-of-home care.

Program Activity

Community Care Licensing program activities include the following:

- Application review/screening
- Complaint investigation
- Evaluation of facilities to determine compliance with licensing standards
- legal/administration actions against substandard facilities
- Orientations for potential applicants
- Renewal application screening and evaluation
- Renewal facility visits
- Follow-up facility visits to ensure the correction to previously cited deficiencies have been made (plan of Correction visits)
- Unlicensed facility visits
- Post licensing visits (except foster family homes)

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Program

General Child Care

Administered by:

Child Development Division

Statutory Authority

Education Code, Section 8200 et seq
(Chapters 16 & 923, statutes of 1943)

Year Enacted: 1943

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	$ 4,100	0	0
Payments	$206,886	0	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$210,986	0	0
Personnel years	55		

Estimated Clients Served

Average Daily Enrollment: 41,228

The Average Daily Enrollment for County Welfare Department Child Care is unavailable and is not included in the above figure.

Objectives

To assure the continuing nurture and development of children during their parents' absence due to vocational pursuits or compelling social or medical necessity.

Eligibility

Must meet one or more of the conditions in each of the following two sections:

Section One:
a. Child at risk of abuse or neglect
b. Public assistance recipient
c. Income eligible

Section Two:
a. Referred by legal, medical, or social service agency because of abuse or neglect
b. Parent in training, employed, or seeking employment
c. Mental or physical incapacity of the parent or child.

Program Activity

General child care and development is composed of four basic program types using child development center and , occasionally family day care homes. These facilities provide basic supervision, age-appropriate development, nutrition, parent education and involvement, staff development and social services. The four General Child Care programs are:

General Child Care and Development Programs - Public Agencies

General Child Care - Private Agencies

Center-Based Title 22 Child Care

Family Day Care

County Welfare Programs

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Program

Migrant Child Development

Administered by:

Child Development Division

Statutory Authority

Education Code, Section 8230-8233
(Chapter 34 & 35, statutes of 1946)

Year Enacted: 1946

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	0	0	0
Payments	$6,616	$2,140	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$6,616	$2,140	
Personnel years	0		

Estimated Clients Served

2,758 Average Daily Enrollment

Objectives

To provide for the care and nurture of children whose parents move frequently, or who have in the recent past moved frequently, to work in agriculture or fishing.

Eligibility

Families must, in the twelve months preceding the date of application, have earned at least 50% of their income from agriculture, agriculturally related work, or fishing. They must, in addition, meet eligibility and need requirements as specified under General Child Care.

Program Activity

Through contracts with public and private agencies the Migrant Child Care and Development program serves children while their parents are employed in fishing, agriculture, or agriculturally related work. Migrant child care centers are open for varying lengths of time during the year depending upon the growing/harvest season in each area.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Program

State Preschool Program

Administered by:

Child Development Division

Statutory Authority

Education Code, Section 8235
(Chapter 1248, statutes of 1965)

Year Enacted: 1965

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	$ 439	0	0
Payments	$36,583	0	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$37,022		
Personnel years	7		

Estimated Clients Served

Average Daily Enrollment: 19,264

Objectives

To provide a part-day comprehensive developmental program for children ages 3-5 years from low income families, to prepare them for successful school participation.

Eligibility

Family income less than 84% of the state median income, adjusted in consideration of family size.

Program Activity

State preschool programs provide a part-day comprehensive developmental program for three to five year old children from low income families. The program includes educational development, health services, social services, nutritional services, parent education and participation, evaluation, and staff development. State Preschool programs are administered by private agencies as well as school districts and County Offices of Education.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Program

Alternative Payment Program

Administered by:

Child Development Division

Statutory Authority

Education Code, Sections 8220-8224
(Chapter 344/76, statutes of 1976)

Year Enacted: 1976

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	0	0	0
Payments	$25,999	0	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$25,999	0	0
Personnel years	0		

Estimated Clients Served

Average Daily Enrollment: 4,881

Objectives

To increase options for choice by eligible parents regarding the location of child care (near home or work) and the type of care (family day care home, in the family's home, or in a center) selected.

Eligibility

Must meet one or more of the conditions in each of the following two sections:

Section One:
a. Child at risk of abuse or neglect
b. Public assistance recipient
c. Income eligible

Section Two:
a. Referred by legal, medical, or social service agency because of abuse or neglect
b. Parent in training, employed, or seeking employment
c. Mental or physical incapacity of the parent or child.

Program Activity

Alternative Payment programs offer an array of child care and development arrangements that include in-home care, family child care homes, and center care. Monthly payment to the child care provider selected by the family is made by the Alternative Payment agency in the form of a vendor payment.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Program

Resource and Referral Program

Administered by:

Child Development Division

Statutory Authority

Education Code, Sections 8210-8214
(Chapter 344, statutes of 1976)

Year Enacted: 1976

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	0	0	0
Payments	$7,335	0	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$7,335		
Personnel years	0		

Estimated Clients Served

N/A

Objectives

To assist parents to select, from among community resources, the most appropriate child care arrangement for their children.

Eligibility

All families are eligible apart from any consideration of eligibility or need.

Program Activity

Resource and Referral programs provide information to parents about available child care and coordinate community resources for the benefit of parents and local child care providers. Typically services are provided over the telephone; walk-in service is also available. As of January, 1986, 59 contracts have been awarded, providing at least one resource and referral site per county.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Program

Severely Handicapped Program

Administered by:

Child Development Division

Statutory Authority

Education Code, Section 8250

Year Enacted: 1976

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	0	0	0
Payments	$ 711	0	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$ 711	0	0
Personnel years	0		

Estimated Clients Served

Average Daily Enrollment: 166

Objectives

To provide child development services for children who, because of handicapping conditions, cannot adequately be cared for in regular child development programs.

Eligibility

The existence of a physical, mental, or emotional handicap, documented by a licensed physician, of such severity as to require care from specially trained staff.

Program Activity

Special programs for the severely handicapped provide supervision, care, therapy, youth guidance, and parental counseling to the eligible children served by the contracting agency.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Program

School-Age Parenting and Infant Development (SAPID)

Administered by:

Child Development Division

Statutory Authority

Education Code, Section 8390-8397
(Chapter 1504, statutes of 1974)

Year Enacted: 1974

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	0	0	0
Payments	$6,668	0	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$6,668		
Personnel years	0		

Estimated Clients Served

Average Daily Enrollment:

842	-Infants
876	-Parents
184	-Pregnant Students, Practicum & theory
66	-Students, Practicum & theory

Objectives

To facilitate completion of a high school education for school-age parents. To provide young parents and pregnant students with parenting skills.

Eligibility

Child care component: Parent mother must be currently enrolled in a secondary school and working toward the completion of a diploma

Parent education component: In addition to participation parent mothers, this component is also open to parent fathers and other interested students

Program Activity

Through contracts with the State Department of Education, these programs are administered by 55 school districts and six county offices of education.

This program enables student parents to complete work toward a high school diploma by providing supervised infant care on or near the school campus. Infant care activities are identical to those in other infant development centers funded by the Child Development Division. Infant centers also serve as a laboratory for parenting education classes.

In addition to infant care parent students and pregnant students receive instruction to improve their ability to care for and relate successfully to their children. In addition to parenting and general education instruction, career development courses are offered to help assure eventual economic independence.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Program

Campus Child Development

Administered by:

Child Development Division

Statutory Authority

Education Code, Section 8225
(Chapter 1767, Statutes of 1971)

Year Enacted: 1971

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	0	0	0
Payments	$10,231	0	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$10,231	0	0
Personnel years	0		

Estimated Clients Served

Average Daily Enrollment: 2,058

Objectives

To provide child development services for children of parents enrolled in higher education programs at two-year and four-year campuses.

Eligibility

Eligibility is identical to that stated for general Child Care. Children of students enrolled at the campus administering the child development program are given priority for admission.

Program Activity

Primarily, these programs provide general child care for the children of students enrolled in college. They are intended to permit parents to complete educational programs. They may also serve as a "hands on" classroom experience for students enrolled in child development classes. The centers are operated by either student associations or the college administration.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Program

State Preschool Incentive Grant

Administered by:

Child Development Division

Statutory Authority

Chapter 795, statutes of 1975
(uncodified statute)

Year Enacted: 1975

Estimated 1986/87
Fiscal Year Expenditures
(in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	0	0	0
Payments	$ 300	0	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$ 300	0	0
Personnel years	0		

Estimated Clients Served

N/A

Objectives

To provide training in child development for staff employed by Child Development Division Contractors.

Eligibility

Staff of State Child Development Division Child Care contractors.

Program Activity

This program provides complete or partial reimbursement to staff of the State Preschool Program (working directly with preschool children) for completed college course work in Early Childhood Education.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Program

Child Care and Employment Act (JTPA)

Administered by:

Child Development Division

Statutory Authority

Education Code, Section 8420-8429
(Chapter 1282, statutes of 1983)
(Chapter 1602, Statutes of 1984)
(Chapter 1066, Statutes of 1986)

Year Enacted: 1983, 1984, 1986

Estimated 1986/87
Fiscal Year Expenditures
(in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	0	$ 65	0
Payments	0	$2,500	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	0	$2,565	0
Personnel years		2	

Estimated Clients Served

Data Not Available

Objectives

To provide child development services in support of parents' participation in the Job Training Partnership Act.

Eligibility

Referral for child care services by a local Private Industry Council.

Program Activity

The Job Training Partnership Act is the federal jobs program replacing the Comprehensive Training and Employment Act (CETA). In 1983 the Child Care and Employment Act was established to help direct JTPA recipients into the subsidized Child development system with the expectation that for many parents the subsidy could continue when JTPA eligibility for supportive services expired. As an incentive to Private Industry Councils to refer families to Child Care and Employment Act contractors, provision was made for a 50-50 funding match between the PICs and the Child Care and Employment Fund contractors.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Program

School-Age Community Child Care

Administered by:

Child Development Division

Statutory Authority

Education Code, Sections 8460-8492
(Chapter 1026, Statutes of 1985)

Year Enacted: 1985

Estimated 1986/87
Fiscal Year Expenditures
(in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	0	0	0
Payments	$15,629	0	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$15,629		
Personnel years	0		

Estimated Clients Served

The total child population served is 13,788; one-half are non-subsidized. Note figure is not presented as ADA.

Objectives

To provide care and supervision of school age children before and after normal school hours.

Eligibility

Must meet one or more of the conditions in each of the following two sections, in order to receive financial assistance. (There are no eligibility standards for nonsubsidized participation.)

Section One:
a. Child at risk of abuse or neglect
b. Public assistance recipient
c. Income eligible

Section Two:
a. Referred by legal, medical, or social service agency because of abuse or neglect
b. Parent in training, employed, or seeking employment
c. Mental or physical incapacity of the parent or child.

Program Activity

Under the School Age Community Child Care Program, the Superintendent of Public Instruction contracts with child care providers (including school districts, private providers, public or private colleges, and other) to provide state-subsidized child care services before and after school for children in Kindergarten through grade Nine. (These services are commonly known as extended day care or "latchkey" child care. Services also are available to children from families not eligible for financial subsidy. In addition, participants in the State's GAIN program, administered by the Department of Social Services, may enroll their school-age children in this program.

The legislature appropriated $8 million (half-year funding) is SB 303 to support the SACCC program in 1985-86. The Legislature continued this level of funding (on an annualized basis) in the 1986 Budget Act, appropriating $15.7 million for the program in 1986-87. In addition, SB 303 appropriated $36.5 million for capital outlay grants to extended day care providers.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Program

Child Care Capital Outlay

Administered by:

Child Development Division

Statutory Authority

Education Code, Section 8277.2, 8485,
and 8493 through 8498
(Chapter 1026 & 1440, statutes of 1985)

Year Enacted: 1980 & 1985

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration(1)	0	0	0
Payments	$43,750	0	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$43,750	0	0
Personnel years	0		

(1) The Department has submitted a request for administration funds, which has not yet been approved

Estimated Clients Served

N/A

Objectives

To provide funds for relocatable facilities and for minor renovation and repair of existing buildings.

Eligibility

Agencies must be current state contractors for child development services.

Program Activity

Through a competitive application process the State Department of Education selects from among eligible applicants those which meet the criteria for funding. The State Allocation Board administers the purchase and lease of relocatable facilities and the allocation of funding for minor renovation and repair to selected agencies.

The funding distribution is as follows:

$14 million for School Age Community Child Care contractors

$22.2 million for facilities serving the school age children of Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN) participants

$7.5 million for nonextended day care facilities

Note: These are one time funds.

Chapter 798, statutes of 1980 established under Education Code, Section 8277.3 a revolving loan fund for capital outlay. At the beginning of the 1986-87 fiscal year the balance in that fund was $185,291. That amount is in addition to the amount shown in the fiscal summary.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Program

Protective Services (Respite) Child Care

Administered by:

Child Development Division

Statutory Authority

Education Code, Sections 8210-8214
(Chapter 344, statutes of 1976)

Year Enacted: 1976

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	0	0	0
Payments	$7,335	0	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$7,335		
Personnel years	0		

Estimated Clients Served

N/A

Objectives

To reduce the risk of abuse or neglect of children by providing parents with respite from their children's care for part of the day.

Eligibility

These services are provided when a child has been abused, neglected or exploited or is at risk of abuse, neglect or exploitation and (1) is a recipient of child protective services and has a written referral from the county welfare department, or (2) has a written referral from a legal, medical or social service agency which states that the child is abused, neglected, or exploited, or at risk of abuse, neglect or exploitation.

Program Activity

Through contract with resource and referral agencies, money is made available for the placement and support of children in need of protective services who could not be accommodated using other designated funds.

DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH

Program

Mental Health Services
to Children and Adolescents

Administered by:

Special Populations Branch

Statutory Authority

Welfare and Institutions Code, Section 5704.6

Year Enacted: 1978

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	0	0	0
Payments	$113,311		
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$113,311		
Personnel years	33.5		

Estimated Clients Served

Unknown

Objectives

To allocate a significant amount of the Short-Doyle mental health augmentations for services to children and adolescents.

Eligibility

Persons under 18 years old are eligible to obtain needed mental health services through the Short-Doyle Program.

Program Activity

The State Department of Mental Health provides State Short-Doyle funds used by county mental health programs for services to children and adolescents. County programs, directly or through contract, provide for an array of mental health services such as: short term crisis, long term residential , day treatment, socialization, case management, medication, in-patient psychiatric, and other care.

The provision of mental health services by each county is individualized, based on locally identified needs. This means that one county may have completely different compared to another county.

The State Department of Mental Health, for the most part, provides 85% of the funds for hospital in-patient services and 90% of other Short-Doyle mental health services. There is a correlating 15% and 10% county match requirement.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES

Program

Child Health and Disability Prevention (CHDP)

Administered by:

Child Health and Disability Prevention Branch
Family Health Division

Statutory Authority

Health and Safety Code Part 1, Chapter 2,
Article 3.4, Sections 320-322.5

Year Enacted:
Federal EPSDT Program: 1967
State CHDP Program: 1975

Estimated 1986/87
Fiscal Year Expenditures
(in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	$ 1,379	$ 1,396	0
Payments	$34,673	$25,939	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$36,057	$27,335	0
Personnel years	33.5		

Estimated Clients Served

Estimated for FY 86/87: 800,000 Served
informing of eligibles at local welfare departments

Objectives

To improve the health status of children through (increased) access to complete and periodic health assessments/ immunizations, and cost containment of future medical costs through early intervention of potentially disabling diseases.

Eligibility

Medi-Cal eligible recipients from birth through age 20.

Infants from birth through 13 months of age whose income is at or below 200% of the Minimum Basic Standard of Adequate Care (MBSAC)

Children 18 months prior to 90 days after first grade entry whose family income is at or below 200% of the MBSAC

Children participation in Head Start or State Preschool programs

Program Activity

CHDP offers health assessment services including health history, physical examinations, immunizations, vision and hearing tests. CHDP health assessments are provided by a wide range of providers including county health departments, local school districts and private providers such as pediatricians and family practitioners.

Services also include annual preventive dental care for Medi-Cal eligible children three years of age and over provided by dentists participating in the Denti-Cal Program.

In addition to the health assessments services offered by the CHDP program, local programs provide case management and and follow-up services. Families are assisted through the CHDP program in obtaining diagnosis and treatment services when necessary. Cooperative interagency agreements with the Department of Social Services provides for.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES

Program Activity

(continued)

of services available and offering assistance with transportation and scheduling.

The program also utilizes outreach and health education to communicate the benefits of program participation

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES

Program

Adolescent Family Life Demonstration Program (AFLP)

Administered by:

Maternal and Child Health Branch

Statutory Authority

1985 Budget Act, Items 4260-111-001 and 4260-111-890

Year enacted: 1985

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	0	0	0
Payments	$ 1,818	$ 3,182	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$ 1,818	$ 3,182	0
Personnel years	0		

Estimated Clients Served

4,000 pregnant and parenting teens

Objectives

To assure the health of both mother and infant, to prepare young parents for parenting, to help them postpone subsequent, unplanned pregnancies, and to help them to develop self sufficiency through education or vocational training.

Eligibility

Pregnant adolescents and adolescent parents who are 17 years of age or under, and their families.

Program Activity

The Maternal and Child Health Branch contracts with county health departments, hospitals, and private agencies to provide case management services to pregnant and parenting teenagers. Activities of case managers primarily concern linking teenage clients to services and agencies already existing in the community.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES

Program

High Risk Infant Follow-Up Program

Administered by:

Maternal and Child Health Branch

Statutory Authority

1980/81 Budget Item 7363-7012-AD2033
1986/87 Budget Item 7329-7012-AD2024

Year enacted: Transferred 1980

Estimated 1986/87
Fiscal Year Expenditures

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	0	0	0
Payments	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$ 1,103	$ 838	0
Personnel years	0		

Estimated Clients Served

4,500

Objectives

To provide, direct, or arrange for appropriate assessment and intervention services for the infants formerly in Neonatal Intensive Care Units to reduce the potential impact of a handicapping condition.

Eligibility

Any infant aged birth to 36 months who because of biological, environmental or psychosocial factors or combination thereof are at high risk of becoming handicapped.

Program Activity

These agencies will identify and enroll infants at risk, assess their need for care, coordinate or provide services to prevent or ameliorate illness or disability, inform and instruct providers in methods of care, and perform planning functions for local health needs, of statewide planning.

DEPARTMENT OF THE YOUTH AUTHORITY

Program

County Justice System Subventions

Administered by:

Administrative Services Branch

Statutory Authority

Welfare and Institutions Code, Section 1805

Year enacted: 1978

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administation	0	0	0
Payments	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$67,298	0	0
Personnel years	0		

Estimated Clients Served

All young people in contact with the juvenile justice system.

Objectives

To augment county funds expended on the juvenile justice system.

Eligibility

All counties receive state subvention funds.

Program Activity

The County Justice System Subvention funds are bloc grants to the counties. Intended to augment county juvenile justice programs, grants are awarded with few controls over the specific use of Subvention funds.

DEPARTMENT OF ALCOHOL AND DRUG PROGRAMS

Program

School-Community Primary Prevention Program
(SCPPP)

Administered by:

Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs and
Department of Education

Statutory Authority

Health and Safety Code, Section 11755

Year Enacted: 1982

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	$ 36	0	0
Payments	$ 1,055	0	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$ 1,091	0	0
Personnel years	0		

Estimated Clients Served

1.7 million

Objectives

To develop, implement and sustain a joint school-community primary prevention program at the county level. In accordance with legislation, the SCPPP covers three broad areas:

- School and classroom-oriented programs that are designed to encourage sound decision making, awareness of values, awareness of drugs and their effects, enhanced self-esteem, social and practical skills that assist students toward maturity.
- School or community-based nonclassroom programs that include positive peer group programs, programs involving youth and adults in constructive activities designed as alternatives to drug use and programs for special population groups such as women and ethnic minorities.
- Family-oriented programs that are aimed at improving family relationships and involving parents constructively in the education and nurturing of their children, as well as in preventing drug abuse.

Eligibility

Targeted youth enrolled in selected schools in the counties that are awarded funds are eligible to participate

Program Activity

Prevention Curriculum development and distribution, parenting classes, peer counseling and education, establishment of youth educators and cross-age helper programs, information dissemination, inservice training for school personnel, development of parent handbooks, youth symposiums, development of parent groups, communication skill training, peer tutoring, community forums and theater, multicultural community activities, and newsletters.

DEPARTMENT OF ALCOHOL AND DRUG PROGRAMS

Program

Services for Drug Clients
18 years of Age and Younger

Administered by:

Drug Division

Statutory Authority

Health and Safety Code, Section 11755

Year Enacted: 1984

Objectives

To provide treatment and prevention services for clients including youth 18 years of age and younger

Eligibility

Must be socially dysfunctional because of drug abuse or in danger of becoming dysfunctional because of drug abuse

Program Activity

Outpatient counseling
Residential (24 hours per day) care
Prevention

**Estimated 1986/87
Fiscal Year Expenditures
(in thousands)**

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	$ 0	0	0
Payments:			
ODF	$ 764	$ 864	$ 180
RFD	$ 685	$ 554	$2,152
PRVN	$ 267	$ 620	$ 199
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$1,716	$2,038	$2,531
Personnel years	0		

ODF = Outpatient Drug-Free
RDF = Residential Drug-Free
PRVN = Prevention

Estimated Clients Served

4,075 Admissions

DEPARTMENT OF ALCOHOL AND DRUG PROGRAMS

Program

Children Recovery Services for Problems Related to Alcohol

Administered by:

Division of Alcohol,
Licensing and Certification Unit

Statutory Authority

Health and Safety Code, Section 11755(a-o)

Year Enacted: 1978

Estimated 1986/87
Fiscal Year Expenditures
(in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	$ 0	0	0
Payments	$ 370	$ 54	$ 200
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$ 370	$ 54	$ 200
Personnel years	4.5	0.5	2.0

Estimated Clients Served

1400

Objectives

To enable individuals to learn to live without using alcohol

Eligibility

Individuals experiencing living problems related to alcohol/drug abuse.

Program Activity

Programs providing these services offer individual, group, and family counseling sessions for varying lengths of time. The initial phase of these programs primarily involve alcohol education sessions and individual counseling sessions. Group and family counseling generally follows.

DEPARTMENT OF ALCOHOL AND DRUG PROGRAMS

Program

Statewide Youth Coordination Project

Administered by:

Division of Alcohol Programs

Statutory Authority

Health and Safety Code, Section 11755(o)

Year Enacted: 1985

Estimated 1986/87
Fiscal Year Expenditures
(in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	$ 68	0	0
Payments	$ 49	0	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$ 117	0	0
Personnel years	1.0		

Estimated Clients Served

Minimum of 750 - 1,000 per year

Objectives

To reduce deaths and injuries due to alcohol-related traffic crashes.

Eligibility

California high school students and adult advisors; student activist groups; and citizen activist groups

Program Activity

The California Youth Coordination Program, a new statewide demonstration project, began operation November 12, 1985. The project operates under the auspices of the California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs, through funds provided by the Office of Traffic Safety. Funds are used to Plan and contract for various youth regional conferences and workshops across the state; issue a statewide newsletter twice a year; and provide technical assistance to local communities and programs on the establishment and operation of youth drinking and driving prevention programs.

DEPARTMENT OF ALCOHOL AND DRUG PROGRAMS

Program

Youth Technical Assistance Project

Administered by:

Division of Alcohol Programs

Statutory Authority

Health and Safety Code, Section 11755(o)

Year Enacted: 1984

Estimated 1986/87
Fiscal Year Expenditures
(in thousands)

		State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	$	0	0	0
Payments	$	50	0	0
Other		0	0	0
TOTALS	$	50	0	0
Personnel years		0		

Estimated Clients Served

N/A

Objectives

To complete statewide needs assessment, identification of effective program models and strategies, and identification of barriers to services for youth. Year two will provide technical assistance statewide to disseminate information and explore possible means of removing barriers to services.

Eligibility

N/A

Program Activity

The goal of the Youth Technical Assistance Project is to increase opportunities for the target population to solve its alcohol-related problems and to ensure that services currently being provided are operating as effectively as possible.

The Center for Human Development, under contract to ADP, conducted a needs assessment regarding specific services for youth, identification of effective models and strategies for providing services, and identification of barriers to services. Under year two of the project, effective strategies identified will be shared on a statewide basis to counties wishing to develop comprehensive programs for youth.

DEPARTMENT OF ALCOHOL AND DRUG PROGRAMS

Program

Public awareness and prevention campaigns:

"Learn to Say NO"
Friday Night Live
NIAAA Youth Media Campaign
Positive Role Model Project

Administered by:

Division of Drug Programs
Executive Office
-- Office of public affairs

Statutory Authority

Health and Safety Code, Section 11755(o)

Year Enacted: 1984 & 1986

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	$ 97	0	0
Payments	$ 402	$ 14	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$ 499	$ 14	0
Personnel years	2.0	0.0	

Estimated Clients Served

The number of targeted youth varies with the program from as few as 4,000 to as many as several million.

Objectives

To reduce the incidence of alcohol and drug abuse by California youth, and foster development of an attitude of intolerance for abuse of alcohol and/or drugs; to reduce teenage deaths and injuries caused by teenagers who are diving under the influence of alcohol or drugs; to increase awareness of the general population regarding issues surrounding adolescent drinking; and to increase knowledge in education and health in ways in which we identify and provide information and curriculum for addressing the needs of children of alcoholics

Eligibility

N/A

Program Activity

Key media campaign elements consist of television and radio public service announcements in English and Spanish featuring celebrity role models conveying the campaign theme and positive messages of life alternatives to drug and alcohol abuse; design of programs to reduce teenage-caused driving under-the-influence deaths and injuries; and presentation of these programs during high school assemblies.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Program

Emergency Shelter Program

Administered by:

Division of Community Affairs

Statutory Authority

Health and Safety Code, Section 50800

Year enacted: 1983

Estimated 1986/87
Fiscal Year Expenditures

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	0	0	0
Payments	$ 3,880	0	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$ 3,880		
Personnel years	0		

Estimated Clients Served

Unknown

Objectives

To provide grant money for emergency shelter providers to assist homeless persons.

Eligibility

An applicant must:

- Be either a government agency or nonprofit corporation that is a current and continuous provider of shelter to homeless persons, or a current continuous contractor with recognized community organizations that provide shelter to homeless persons;
- provide shelter which is temporary and available to residents for no more that 60 days, including extensions, or up to 180 days for clients certified to be seniors, or mentally or physically handicapped;
- practice non-discrimination in all program; not require participation in a religious or philosophical service;
- not require a fee or donation as a condition of receiving shelter; apply for fund activities which will meet all local government standards.

Program Activity

Each region of the State has been allocated a portion of the total appropriation based on a formula (number of persons unemployed and number of persons living in poverty), similar to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) distribution formula.

After local review and prioritizing, the application will be submitted to ESP for final review and award announcement. In regions where there is no local board, applications must be submitted directly to ESP for review and ranking.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Program Activity

(continued)

Activities eligible for funding:

- Rehabilitation/Renovation/expansion of existing shelter facilities (no new construction)
- site acquisition
- equipment purchase
- program costs (maintenance, utilities, or staff providing direct client services)
- vouchers
- one-time rent to prevent eviction
- administration

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Program

Campus Child Care

Administered by:

Campus Administration at each campus

Statutory Authority

Education Code, Section 8225
(for SDE funding only)

Year enacted: 1971

Estimated 1986/87
Fiscal Year Expenditures
(in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Other funds
Administation	-	-	-
Payments	-	-	-
Other (Operations)	($1,101)	-	$2,401
TOTALS	($1,101)	-	$2,401
Personnel years	N/A		

Note: State funds shown are provided from approrpriations made to the State Department of Education.
Other funds shown are from the following sources: Registration fees ($1,195,000), Parent fees ($996,200), Donor funds ($55,700), and other ($154,000))

Estimated Clients Served

877 children served
830 families served

Objectives

Primarily, to provide child care for the children of University students. Secondarily, to provide child care for University staff and faculty.

Eligibility

Generally, one parent must be a registered University student or, in some cases, a University staff or faculty member. (Guidelines vary from campus to campus.

Program Activity

Activities are contingent upon individual program type, funding, and age group of the children served. The child care centers are operated by either student associations or the college administration. The following activities apply to most campus child care programs.

- Provide Developmental Child Care Services
- Maintain Administrative Services
- Provide Parent Orientation and Education
- Provide a Food Services for children in the program
- Supervise and Train career and casual staff
- Provide Research and Volunteer Opportunities
- Outreach to the campus and wider communities

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

Program

Campus Child Care

Administered by:

Dean of Academic Affairs
Dean of Students

Statutory Authority

Education Code, Section 8225
(for SDE funds only)

Year enacted: 1971

Estimated 1986/87
Fiscal Year Expenditures
(in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Other funds
Administation	0	0	0
Payments	$1,306	0	$2,160
TOTALS	$1,306	0	$2,160
Personnel years			

Other funds include parent fees, student fees, and private contributions.

Estimated Clients Served

1800 children

Objectives

Primarily, to provide child care for children of University students. Secondly, to provide child care for University staff and faculty.

Eligibility

Depending on the individual program, eligibility standards tend to vary. Basically, one parent must be a registered University student or, in some cases, a University staff or faculty member.

Program Activity

Activities are contingent upon individual program type, funding, and age group of the children served. The child care centers are operated by either student associations or the college administration. Some or all of the following activities apply to most campus child care programs.

- Provide Developmental Child Care Services
- Maintain Administrative Services
- Provide Parent Orientation and Education
- Provide a Food Services for children in the program
- Supervise and Train career and casual staff
- Provide Research and Volunteer Opportunities
- Outreach to the campus and wider communities

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Program

Cooperative Agencies Resources for Education
(CARE)

Administered by:

Student Services/Special Programs Division

Statutory Authority

Education Code, Section 79150
(Chapter 1029; Statutes of 1982)

Year enacted: 1982

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	$ 25	0	0
Payments	$ 711	0	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$ 736	0	0
Personnel years	0		

Estimated Clients Served

1200 single parent AFDC Recipients and their children (average 2 or 3 children each)

Objectives

To provide educational opportunities to single parent, head of household AFDC recipients who seek to enhance their employability and minimize their welfare dependency through enrollment in a vocationally oriented program; to provide necessary support for their academic success and retention; and to assist them in their pursuit of career and vocational goals.

Eligibility

Participants must be at least 18 years old, be a single head of household, be receiving AFDC for at least one consecutive year, lack marketable skills, and desire to complete their high school education or pursue job relevant curricula. The participant must have at least one child under the age of six years, or have completed job search activities under the supervision of the county welfare department and not have secured employment.

Program Activity

Through the Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges, Student Services and Special Programs Division, funds are allocated to community college districts for operation of the program. Funds are used primarily for child care expenses, transportation costs, books and supplies, and for support services including tutoring, assessment and placement. It is a cooperative effort involving the community college, local county welfare departments and employment development offices. Currently, 22 community colleges serving 24 counties receive supplemental funds to provide CARE services and activities.

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Program

California Community College Campus Child Care Development Centers

Administered by:

Student Services/Special Programs Division

Statutory Authority

Education Code, Section 79120

Year enacted: 1980

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	0	0	0
Payments Other	$(4,026)	0	0
TOTALS	$(4,026)	0	0
Personnel years	N/A		

Estimated Clients Served

Approximately 6000 children

Objectives

Service: To provide child care which is developmentally oriented for the children of student parents to enable them to attend college.

Instructional: To provide community leadership in child development through the training of child teachers, educating parents and potential parents, and setting up model child development centers which exemplify the best practices in child development.

Eligibility

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, children under two tears of age whose parent or parents are students may attend child development centers consistent with the priorities established pursuant to law. Highest priority shall be given to student families with the greatest income deficit.

Program Activity

Three types of child care programs are currently administered by California's community colleges. They are: Child Development Schools, which serve as training programs for students pursuing child development and early childhood education careers; Campus Child Care and Development Programs, which not only serve the child and family support needs of student parents, but also promote the cognitive, physical, social and emotional growth and development of the children enrolled; and Combination programs, which focus equally on child development instruction and services.

Among the eighty-two (82) colleges providing child care service, combination programs presently account for sixty-nine percent (69%) of the child care and development services offered.

OFFICE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING

Program

Youth Emergency Telephone Referral Project
(California Runaway Hotline)

Administered by:

Juvenile Justice Division

Statutory Authority

(Chapter 1614, statutes of 1984)
(AB 3075)

Year Enacted: 1984

Estimated 1986/87
Fiscal Year Expenditures
(in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	$ 20	0	0
Payments	$180	0	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$200	0	0
Personnel years	.25		

Estimated Clients Served

6,000-10,000 youth and adult callers per year

Objectives

The California Runaway Hotline has been implemented to serve as a free, nonthreatening , telephone referral service for runaways, directing them to available resources, including shelter, meals, clothing, counseling, and other services necessary for their will-being and to be a message center for runaways who wish to communicate with their parents.

Eligibility

The California Runaway Hotline is avialable to California youth and parents who request its service.

Program Activity

A contract for the implementation of the California Runaway Hotline has been awarded to the California Child, Youth and Family Coalition, a non-profit organization located in Sacramento.

The Hotline became operational on September 2, 1986 and is presently receiving calls from youth and parents seeking services. The Hotline has the capablity to patch the caller directly in to services located in the caller's area. The Hotline also acts a a message referral center for parents, guardians, or youth seeking to get a message to one another but not wanting to talk directly.

OFFICE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING

Program

Homeless Youth Pilot Project

Administered by:

Juvenile Justice Division

Statutory Authority

Welfare and Institutions Code, Section 13700

Year Enacted: 1985

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

		State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration		$ 48	0	0
Payments	SF	$368	0	0
	LA	$552		
Other		0	0	0
TOTALS		$920	0	0
Personnel years		.5		

Estimated Clients Served

1,500 (San Francisco Project)
1,500 (Los Angeles Project)

3,000 Total

Objectives

To establish a Homeless Youth Emergency Sercvices Pilot Project in the County of Los Angeles and in the City and County of San Francisco. Each of the pilot projects is to include but is not limited to the following:

- Food and access to an overnight shelter
- Counseling for immediate emotional crisis
- Outreach services to locate homeless youth and link them with services and drop-in facilities to make the services accessible to the street population
- Screening and referral for basic health need
- linkage to other agency services
- long term stabilization planning
- followup services

Eligibility

Eligibility limited to private, non-profit agencies which demonstrate an ability to meet the objectives listed above and demonstrate a history of coordination with other public and private agencies in the service region that provide services to homeless youth.

Program Activity

Grants were awarded to the Catholic Social Services in San Francisco and the Children's Hospital in Los Angeles. Both of the recipients are joined in their respective projects by several other youth-serving agencies to provide a network of services that meet the required objectives.

OFFICE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING

Program

Child Sexual Abuse Prevention Program

Administered by:

Sexual Assualt/Child Sexual Abuse Unit

Statutory Authority

California Penal Code, Section 13837

Year Enacted: 1980

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	0	0	0
Payments		0	0
Los Angeles	$103		
San Pablo	$ 64		
Stockton	$ 26		
San Jose	$ 57		
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$250	0	0
Personnel years	0		

Estimated Clients Served

300	Latino Children (Los Angeles Project)
2,200	Children (San Pablo Project)
264	Children (Stockton Project)
1,000	Parents (San Jose Project)
600	Educators (San Jose Project)

Objectives

To develop effective prevention, identification, and intervention programs which can be replicated, and to increase the level of knowledge about child sexual abuse and exploitation.

Eligibility

Agencies funded under this program must be rape crisis centers which operate 24-hour telephone counseling services for sex crime victims.

Program Activity

The grants for the Child Sexual Abuse Prevention Program were awarded for a two-year perid beginning July 1, 1985. The awards were made to East Los Angeles Rape Hotline, Rape Crisis Center of West Contra Costa, Sexual Assault Center of San Joaquin County in Stockton, and the YWCA in San Jose.

OFFICE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING

Program

Child Sexual Abuse Prevention Training Centers

Administered by:

Sexaul Assualt/Child Sexual Abuse Unit

Statutory Authority

(Chapter 1664, statutes of 1984)
AB 3684 (Vasconcellos)

Year Enacted: 1984

Estimated 1985/86 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	0	0	0
Payments		0	0
Los Angeles	$350		
San Francisco	$350		
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$700	0	0
Personnel years	0		

Estimated Clients Served

Total Number of Persons Trained:	1,979
Total Number of Training Hours Provided:	30,611

Objectives

To increse the level of knowledge about child sexual abuse treatment among professionals in the field.

Eligibility

AB 3684 (Vasconcellos), Chapter 1664, 1984 statutes authorized the establishment of two training centers to provide training and technical assistance to multidisciplinary teams of professionals providing intervention services to sexually abused children and their families

Program Activity

The statute required two centers to be funded in Northern and Southern California. The Institute for Community as Extended Family (ICEF) in San Jose and Childrens Institute International (CII) in Los Angeles were selected for funding.

OFFICE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING

Program

Child Sexual Abuse and Exploitation
Treatment Projects

Administered by:

Sexual Assualt/Child Sexual Abuse Unit

Statutory Authority

California Penal Code, Section 13837

Year Enacted: 1982

Estimated 1986/87
Fiscal Year Expenditures
(in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration			
Payments			
San Diego	$ 84		
Los Angeles	$150		
Sacramento	$100		
Other			
TOTALS	$334		
Personnel years			

Estimated Clients Served

Los Angeles Project:	600
Sacramento Project:	86
San Diego Project:	600
Total	1,286

Objectives

To continue the State's leadership in developing new approaches, services or products ion the area of child sexual abuse. Each of the projects may incorporate the following suggestions:

- innovative adolescent prevention programs;
- child sexual abuse treatment programs;
- developing evaluation tools for school-based prevention programs;
- provide treatment to juvenile sex offenders who are victims of child sexual abuse.

Eligibility

An agency eligible to apply for funds to operate a child sexual prevention and exploitation treatment project must be a nonprofit agency or a unit of local government with a demonstrated record of success in the delivery of services to victims of sexual abuse.

Program Activity

The grants for the Child Sexual Abuse Prevention and Exploitation Program were awarded for a two-year period beginning July 1, 1985. The awards were made to Children's Hospital and Health Center in San Diego, Harbour - UCLA Medical Center in Los Angeles, and Sacramento Child Sexual Abuse Treatment Program.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Program

Child Abuse Central Index
(CACI)

Administered by:

Division of Law Enforcement

Statutory Authority

Penal Code, Sections 11169-70

Year Enacted: 1965

**Estimated 1986/87
Fiscal Year Expenditures**
(in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	$ 700	0	0
Payments	0	0	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$ 700		
Personnel years	23		

Estimated Clients Served

Unknown

Objectives

To direct child protective investigators to records held by other child protective agencies.

Eligibility

Child Protective Agencies, including Law Enforcement, Welfare, Probation and District Attorneys.

Program Activity

The Child Abuse Reporting Law requires that Child Protective Agencies (CPA) submit reports of their investigations of child abuse incidents to the Department of Justice in order to determine if the persons involved in the alleged incidents have been involved in child abuse. The Department of Justice must immediately notify contributing CPAs and district attorney's offices which request notification of any prior history information and must extract information from the reports for inclusion in the Child Abuse Central Index (CACI).

When a Child Abuse Investigation Report is received by the Department of Justice, the Child Abuse Central Index is searched to determine if the suspects or victims in the incoming reports have prior histories of child abuse involvement.

CACI information directs an investigator to complete investigation reports held by contributing CPAs. The complete investigation reports assist the investigator in determining whether or not a child should be removed from an endangering situation and provides details about a suspect's prior behavior to enhance the current investigation.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Program

Child Development Programs Advisory Committee (CDPAC)

Administered by:

Child Development Programs Advisory Committee

Statutory Authority

Education Code, Section 8286

Year Enacted: 1965

Estimated 1986/87 Fiscal Year Expenditures (in thousands)

	State funds	Federal funds	Local funds
Administration	$ 216	0	0
Payments	$ 0	0	0
Other	0	0	0
TOTALS	$ 216		
Personnel years	3.3		

Estimated Clients Served

34,039 Family day care providers
7,364 Center based care programs

Objectives

To provide public review of child care and development programs; to review child development program policy; to report to the Legislature on program effectiveness and recommend areas for program expansion and restructuring; to advise the Governor, State Superintendent, the Legislature, and Department heads as appropriate.

Eligibility

All California children in need of child care.

Program Activity

Statutory History

1965 - Established to review and assist the State to establish a preschool program similar to Head Start.

1970 - Added responsibility to review day care and child development.

1972 - Added functions emphasizing evaluation of new alternative child care programs.

1984 - Required Committee to assist in developing guidelines for establishing a division of child day care licensing and a statewide child care ombudsman program.

1985 - Added responsibility to serve in an advisory capacity to the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Governor for program policy decisions on Chapter 1026.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Program Activity

(continued)

In the past the Committee has been involved in a variety of tasks:

- Prepared child consumer education material (videos, brochures, workshops) for parents;
- Monitored the implementation of the Community School Age Child Care Act (SB 303) Monitored the implementation of the DSS Title II Child Abuse Training Program for child care providers.
- Produced reports:

  The Role of Child Care in Child Abuse Prevention

  School Age Child Care Report

  Second Language Learning by Young Children

Future plans include:

- developing methods to assist children with special needs and determine existing resources
- gathering data on teenage pregnancy and assess available resources
- investigating possibility of establishing a telephone information hotline for all children's services
- exploring with DSS methods to increase licensing evaluations and enforcement of licensing regulations
- reviewing teacher requirements for early childhood education,
- continuing distribution of child care consumer education materials
- comparing the activities of agencies which investigate child abuse in child care facilities.